

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

DEC 1 0 2007

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Recensio Synoptica
ANNOTATIONIS SACRÆ.

IN TWO PARTS.

PART II.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

DEC 1 0 2007

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Recensio Synoptica
ANNOTATIONIS SACRÆ;
BEING A
CRITICAL DIGEST
AND
SYNOPTICAL ARRANGEMENT
OF THE MOST IMPORTANT
ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT,
EXEGETICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND DOCTRINAL:
CAREFULLY COLLECTED AND CONDENSED, FROM THE BEST COMMENTATORS,
BOTH ANCIENT AND MODERN,
AND SO DIGESTED AS TO FORM ONE CONSISTENT BODY OF ANNOTATION,
In which
Each Portion is systematically attributed to its respective Author,
AND THE FOREIGN MATTER TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH;
The whole accompanied with
A COPIOUS BODY OF ORIGINAL ANNOTATIONS.

BY THE REV. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, M. A.

OF SIDNEY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, VICAR OF BISBROOKE IN RUTLAND, AND RESIDENT
CURATE OF TUGBY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

Οὐ σοφισταὶ ἤκομεν, οὐδὲ ἀπιστεῖν ἔτοιμοι, θεαταὶ δὲ μόνον τῶν
γεγραμμένων, ἐξετάζομεν τὴν Γραφήν.

Philostr. Jun. Icon. 1. 24.

"Οπου οὐκ ἔστι πίστις, ἅπαντα ροσεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ μάχαι τίκονται
λόγων, τοῦ πιθανοτέρου τὸν ἕτερον ἀνατρέπειν δοκοῦντος· Ἡ πίστις
ὀφθαλμός ἐστιν· ὁ μὴ ἔχων ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐδὲν εὕρισκε, ἀλλὰ μόνον
ζητεῖ.

Theophylact, from Chrysostom.

VOL. VIII.

LONDON:

C. AND J. RIVINGTON,

62, ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; AND 3, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

MDCCCXXVIII.

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

CHAP. I.

This Epistle, according to the custom of St. Paul, begins with a salutation, ver. 12., then thanks to God for the progress of the church in Christianity, ver. 3—8., and prayers to Him to preserve and confirm it in the same, ver. 9. seqq. (Heinrichs.) The commencement of this Epistle is nearly the same as that of the one to the Ephesians, where see the note.

VERSE 1. ὁ ἀδελφός, “our brother,” i. e. brother minister. See the note on Phil. 4, 21.

2. Κολοσσαῖς. Several antient MSS. read Κολασσαῖς, which is probably the true reading, But such points are of difficult decision. Thus, in Thucyd., instead of the common reading Μιτυλήνη and Συρακουσίοι and Μυτιλήνη, the best MSS., coins, and inscriptions, read Συρακοσίοι and Μυτιλήνη.

3. εὐχαριστοῦμεν—προσευχόμενοι. The πάντοτε may be joined either with εὐχαριστοῦμεν (as it is done by the recent Commentators), or with προσευχόμενοι, as it is done by the antient and earlier moderns. The former construction is confirmed by 1 Cor. 1, 11. 1 Thess. 1, 2. 2 Thess. 1, 3. Yet the latter, which is supported by Rom. 1, 10., is the more natural. Πάντοτε may, however, be said to belong to both words.

4. ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν—ἀγίους. Heinrichs explains πίστις *accessio ad Christum*. And by ἀγάπη he understands *palmaria virtus*, for *omnis virtutis Christianæ ambitus*. But this is too artificial. It is better to interpret the words in their plain and na-

tural acceptance; the former as denoting the profession of the Christian religion: the latter, kindness and charity towards the poor brethren, whether townsmen or strangers. But the *full* sense of πιστ. and ἀκούσαντες will depend upon the determination of the question whether the Church at Colossæ had been founded by St. Paul or not: a point rather doubtful; since the passages adduced admit of some latitude of interpretation. Yet, upon the whole, the evidence for the latter opinion seems the stronger. The church was probably founded by Epaphras. So the antients and many moderns.

5. διὰ τὴν ἐμπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The Apostle now proceeds to accumulate period on period; whence in this chapter we find the construction not a little embarrassed, and, by frequent additions, the context much protracted; just as in the Epistle to the Ephesians. (Heinr.)

The words seem connected with the εὐχαριστοῦμεν, &c. at ver. 3.; though some refer them to those immediately preceding, with this sense: "because of the felicity which ye know is thereby laid up for you in heaven." Of both the constructions mention is made by the antients.

By ἐλπ. is meant not so much the *hope itself* as the *thing hoped for*; a frequent sense. See the examples of Kypke and Loesn. or Schleus. Lex. in v. Rosenm. observes that this ἐλπ. is represented under the image of a βραβεῖον, or ἄθλος, which πρόκειται, ἀπόκειται. See at Hebr. 6, 8. And so Joseph. Ant. 8, 12, 3. and Philo 834. D. and often. But *here* the term is ἀποκειμ., in which there cannot be an *agonistical* allusion; but rather one to *money* or *rich goods laid up* in a royal treasury, and to be distributed to the deserving. Thus Heinr. cites Plut. 1, 521. τοῖς ἐν βεβαιωκόσιν ἀπόκειται γέρας ἐν ἄδου.* The chief intent of the metaphor is to represent the felicity hoped for as *sure* and *certain*, like a sum

* So also good offices were metaphorically said to be laid up, i. e. the reward of them; as in Thucyd. 1, 129. κεῖται σοι εὐεργεσία.

deposited in a royal treasury, or that of some temple inviolable. So Theophyl. : *μη οὖν ἀμφιβάλλετε περὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος· ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ γὰρ ἀποκεῖται.*

5. *ἣν προηκούσατε.* By the *προ*, Commentators, both antient and modern, are agreed, is signified *formerly, at the beginning*, namely, of their *conversion*. This implies that some considerable time had since elapsed. The *ἡκούσατε* has reference to catachetical and oral instruction. *Ἀληθείας*, Rosenm. would take as put for the cognate adjective. But I prefer, with Heinr., to regard *λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας* as a periphrasis for *the Christian religion* (as in 2 Cor. 6, 7. and Eph. 1, 13.) ; and *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* for *εὐαγγελιζομένου*.

6. *τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς—ἀληθείᾳ.* On the sense of *παρόντος* the Commentators are not agreed. The antients took it for *ὅς πάρεστι, κρατεῖ, ἐνεργεῖ*. Thus *εἰς ὑμᾶς* will be for *ἐν ὑμῖν*. And so several moderns. But this seems very harsh. It appears preferable, with Grot. and most recent Commentators, to take *παρόντος* in that sense which, especially when followed by *εἰς*, the word often has in the Classical writers. Raphel adduces some examples from Polyb. (to which several from Thucyd. might be added.) And so 2 Cor. 2, 11. 11, 8. 13, 2 & 10. Gal. 4, 18 & 20. Though sometimes it is uncertain whether the sense *to be*, or *to go*, is preferable. Here *come* is, by a common idiom, for *brought, preached*.

Καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, “as has been the case with all the world.” Heinr. considers this as put for, “not the Jews only, but all nations.” This method, however, though meant to avoid a difficulty in *τῷ κοσμῷ*, taken in the ordinary way, is too harsh. Nor is it necessary. The best Commentators are agreed that it may be regarded as a popular hyperbole (see Rom. 1, 8.) ; though it is probable that there were few countries of the *civilized* world into which the Gospel had not been, by this time, introduced ; and for savages it was not *intended*, since civilization must necessarily precede evangelization.

Καὶ ἐστὶ καρποφορούμενον. All the Commentators

seem agreed that ἔστι καρποφορούμενον is for καρποφορεῖ. But why, then (it may be asked) did not the Apostle so write? Because, I apprehend, he meant something *more*. For *is bearing* somewhat differs from *bears*. So of a tree, when its fruit is in the bud, we may say καρποφορῶν ἔστι, or καρποφορούμενος, but afterwards καρποφορεῖ: and I apprehend that the Apostle meant thus to represent a state of the Gospel in some of the many countries of the world into which it had been introduced. By the *fruit* is meant, by a common metaphor (as Matt. 13, 23. Mark 4, 20. Luke 8, 15. and Rom. 7, 4.) the fruit of reforming and blessing men *here*, and by the production of good works, as the fruits of faith, making them meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light *hereafter*. This metaphorical sense of κάσπος is rare in the Classical writers, and the philological Commentators adduce no example. The following may therefore be acceptable. Plut. Arat. 10. ἀπεργάζεστε τὴν ἀρεπὴν, ὥσπερ καρπὸν αὐτοφυῆ καὶ ἀγεωργητόν.

After καρποφορούμενον several MSS. have καὶ αὐξάνόμενον, which is supported by almost all the Versions, and some Fathers and Greek Commentators, and has been approved by most Critics, and admitted into the text by Griesbach; but, I think, on insufficient grounds. The reason assigned for its omission, namely, homoioteleuton, is not satisfactory: for how could such an accidental error have extended itself to so many MSS.? It is far more probable, as is the opinion of Wolf, Wets., and Matthæi (on the authority of Chrys.), that it was introduced from ver. 10.

Καθὼς καὶ ὑμῖν, “as it has also done among you.” Ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας—ἀληθεία. The Commentators are not agreed to what to refer the ἐν ἀληθεία, whether to ἐπέγνωσε, taking ἐν ἀληθεία for ἀληθῶς (as Joh. 4, 24.), or to χάριν, by hendiadis, for χάριν ἀληθῆ. The *former* method is far preferable. Other less probable constructions are detailed by Rosenm. and Heinr. Theophyl. well explains thus: οὐκ ἐν ἀπάτῃ

καὶ λόγοις εἰκαίοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, τούτέστι, σημείοις καὶ ἔργοις παραδόξοις.

7, 8. καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε. Heinr. rightly refers καθὼς to ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, for ἀληθῶς. Συγδούλ., *fellow minister*. Ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, “for your advantage;” a frequent signification of ὑπὲρ. Compare 2 Cor. 4, 5. Ἀγάπη must be interpreted as at ver. 4., where see the note. Ἐν πνεύματι is by some, as Menoch. Beza, and Whitby, interpreted, “wrought in you by the spirit.” But this seems not to be the sense here; especially as there is no article. I prefer the interpretation of Grot. and most modern Commentators (confirmed also by the antients), who take it to signify “*spiritual, sincere, and as becometh the Gospel.*” The antients, and some moderns, regard the love in question as that borne by the Colossians towards Paul. But *that*, if (as it seems) they had not yet seen him, is rather improbable. It is, besides, far more natural to take it of *love towards each other*, as *supra* ver. 4.

9. The Apostle now (according to his usual custom), to the rendering of thanks adds prayers for the furtherance of the Colossians in Christianity. Before all things he prays that they may have a progressively better and truer *knowledge* of this saving doctrine, since on that may be laid the superstructure of true *Christian virtue*. Now this admonition was necessary, on account of the Judaizing and fanatical teachers, who endeavoured to persuade the Colossians that the doctrine of Christ was insufficient to bless men. (Heinr.)

9. ἵνα πληρωθῇτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, “that ye may be filled with divine knowledge.” At ἐπίγνωσιν must be understood κατὰ. Of αὐτοῦ the antecedent is Θεοῦ at ver. 6. The θελ. is explained by Rosenm. of the divine precepts; and thus ἐπιγν. τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, will be, “a knowledge of what God would have us know, believe, and do.” But I prefer, with Heinr., to understand it of the divine plans for the salvation of men by Christ. So Theophyl. well explains: θέλημα γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ

εὐδοκία, τὸ τὸν. Υἱὸν δοθῆναι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, οὐχὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. He also observes, that the πληρ. implies that that knowledge was yet incomplete and imperfect. On the sense of the rest of the verse see the notes on Ephes. 1, 8. and Doddr. in loc.

10. περιπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν. At περιπατ. must be understood εἰς τὸ. The preposition here, as often, indicates the *end* and *tendency*. For a life and *conduct* worthy of Christ and his religion was the fruit to be expected from a right *knowledge*. At εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν subaud τοῦ Θεοῦ, from the next clause. The term ἀρεσκεία signifies the *study of pleasing others*, and is therefore capable both of a good, and a bad sense. In the Classical writers it is almost always used in the *latter*: but examples of the *former* are found; as Polyb. (cited by Raphel) ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀρεσκεία and, what is more to the purpose, Philo 33 c. (cited by Loesner) where it is said of Adam: εἰς ἀρεσκείαν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ βασιλέως.

The words following suggest *how* this ἀρεσκεία may be accomplished, namely, 1st, by perseverance in rendering the fruit of good works; 2dly, by patience and constancy in temptation and adversity. On καρποφοροῦντες, see the note supra ver. 6. There is an enallage for καρποφοροῦντας; though some refer all the nominatives to πληρωθῆτε. The ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες, evidently refers to *good works*; the αὐξανόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, to that *correct knowledge of God's will* by which alone good works can be produced. The εἰς is rendered by Storr. *quod attinet ad*. But this is too feeble a sense: and I remember no example of εἰς after αὐξ. in this sense. Heinr. renders it *suitably to*, which makes a good sense, but not, I think, that which the Apostle intended. Besides, it would require κατὰ. The interpretation is, however, supported by Theophyl.: νῦν αὖθις ἀπαιτεῖ αὐξάνειν ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις, εἰς τὸ ἅμα καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις, εἰς τὸ ἅμα καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιγινώσκειν· ἐκάτερον γὰρ ἐκατέρου συστατικόν. After all,

I see no reason to desert the common interpretation, by which *αὖξ. εἰς* is taken as synonymous with *αὖξ. ἐν*, which is found in some MSS., or *αὖξ.* by itself, which is found in many others, and is received by Griesb. (and so 2 Pet. 3, 18.); but (I think) on insufficient grounds. It savours of a gloss, and the common reading is sufficiently defended both by its greater difficulty, and by a similar construction in the Twin Epistle (Eph. 4, 15.) *αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν* (i. e. *Christ*), where see the note. When the nature of the term *αὐξάνειν* is considered, such a construction will not seem strange. The Apostle has placed the two particulars together, the *increase of knowledge* and *that of virtue*, well knowing that they always tend to mutually produce each other.

11. *ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, for *ἐνδυναμούμενοι πάσῃ δυνάμει*. This very energetic expression *ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κ. τ. κ. δ.* (where *τῆς δόξης* is for the cognate adjective) must denote those powerful and *extraordinary aids* of the holy spirit then vouchsafed to faithful Christians; though the *ordinary influences* of the same blessed spirit are given to all of every succeeding age to profit withal.

The words *εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν μετὰ χαρᾶς*, show the *end* and *purpose* of such extraordinary aids, namely, that they might bear every sort of temptation and persecution with patience, nay, even alacrity. For such is the sense of this condensed, and therefore obscure, clause. *Μακροθυμία* must here denote, not (as the antients say) a *slowness to anger*, but, as appears from the following words *μετὰ χαρᾶς* (which stand in the place of a cognate adjective), *patience of endurance*.

12—14. These verses close (like an epilogus,) what he had thus far said; q. d. “And if in this manner you perceive the power of the Christian doctrine, and show it in good works, you will not doubt whether that doctrine points the true and right way to salvation, but, persuaded that to it you owe all your

happiness, you will assuredly render thanks to God, for having admitted you, though Gentiles, into the Christian society. (Heinr.)

12. εὐχαριστοῦντες—ἐν τῷ φωτί, “And that we may return thanks to the Father, who, by this knowledge, hath fitted you to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints,” &c. Such is the general sense of the passage, which, however, from brevity of expression, and idiotical phraseology, is somewhat obscure.

12. τῷ ἱκανώσαντι. At this word both the antient and the modern Critics have stumbled. Hence the reading καλέσαντι, which was as much a *conjecture* as that of Bentley, καινώσαντι; and both equally unnecessary. The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed, that the term ἱκ. is here to be taken in a sense, somewhat rare indeed, but of which the nature of the word is very susceptible, namely, *meet, fit*. So Theophyl. explains: ἐπιτηδείους. Schleus. defines the word thus: *sufficientem reddo, idoneum, aptum facio, facultatem alicujus rei efficiendæ largior*. And he adduces as examples of this sense, 2 Cor. 3, 6. ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καὶ νῆς διαθήκης.

Eis τὴν μερίδα coming after ἱκανώσ., is a *locutio prægnans*, signifying “*fit for* (a participation in) the portion of the inheritance,” &c. Heinr. observes, that ἅγιος, answering to the Hebr. כֹּהֵן, was the *sublimior Christianorum appellatio*, as it had been that of the Jews. The figure (he adds) here adopted (which is similar to one in Acts 20, 32. 26, 18. and Eph. 1, 18.) is that of a state whose citizens have assigned to each of them a μέρος, portion, or possession (see Gen. 14, 24.); and all these are supposed to be assigned by lot, κλήρω. So that μέρος κλήρου is for “an allotted portion.” The above interpretation is confirmed by Theophyl., who explains thus: τῷ μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων κατατάξαντι· καὶ οὐχ οὕτως ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύσαι παρεσχηκότι· ὁ διὰ τῆς μερίδος δηλοῖ· Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει καταταγῆναι, οὐ μὴν τὴν αὐτὴν μερίδα ἔχειν· καὶ πάλιν, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κλήρῳ εἶναι, ἀλλ’ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν μερίδα· οἶον, ἐν τῷ

αὐτῷ κλήρω τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντες ἐσμὲν, ἀλλὰ ἄλλος ἄλλην ἔχειν μερίδα. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κλήρου ἡξίωσε, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μερίδος.

The ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is by some taken for διὰ τοῦ φωτός. (See Rosenm.) But the common interpretation in *light*, seems preferable. Φῶς is, by a common image, put for *light, knowledge*. Thus Christians are said to be *sons of light*, πεφωτισμένοι. And the Deity is metaphorically represented as *dwelling in light*. Theophyl. explains φωτὶ by γνώσει: and he thinks it refers to both the present and the future world: for *now* God hath enlightened us by a revelation of divine mysteries; and in the future word he will impart it far more clearly. By *us* is meant, us *Christians*, whether Jews or Gentiles.

13. ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους, "who hath liberated us from the power of darkness," i. e. the dominion of ignorance, sin, and Satan. In this sense ἐξουσία is used in Rom. 13, 1. and elsewhere. The image in σκότους was evidently suggested by that in the preceding verse. It is frequently used to designate the state of the Gentiles before their conversion to Christianity; as 1 Pet. 2, 9. Acts 26, 18. The ἐξουσίας and ἐρρύσατο suggest the harshness of the tyranny under which they had groaned: and it is well observed by Wets. and Heinr., that under the ἐξουσίας is couched a notion of *despotism*, or *tyranny*. The words φῶς and σκότος carry with them an adjunct notion of *happiness* and *misery*, especially with reference to a future world.

13. μετέστησεν. Heinr. remarks on the aptness of the term; since it is not only used of the transferring of persons from one habitation to another, and of transplanting any by colonization, but also of changing a form of government; as from oligarchy to democracy. So here those who had been under the despotism of ignorance and Satan, are represented as being transferred to the kingdom of knowledge, virtue, and Christ, in which they have each their allotted portion." Τῆς ἀγάπης is plainly for ἀγαπήμενου.

14. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. These words have been explained at Eph. 1, 7.

There are few passages on which the opinions of Commentators are more divided. The antients almost universally and the early moderns taking the terms of the passage in their literal sense, interpret it of the *natural creation of all things by Christ*; and hence deduce a strong argument for the divinity of Christ. On the other hand the later Commentators, (including Grot. and Whitby, and especially the recent ones,) objecting that the above interpretation is not agreeable to the context, take the passage to refer to the new and spiritual creation by Jesus Christ; which, they maintain, is quite correspondent to the context and the phraseology of many parallel passages, as Eph. 1, 10 and 21. 2, 10 and 15. 3, 9 and 10. 4, 22—24. Col. 3, 10 and 11. Rom. 3, 11 seqq. James 1, 18. 2 Cor. 5, 17. They particularly dwell on the similarity of style and subject matter in this and the twin Epistle (to the Ephesians), from which (3; 10.) it appears that by the revelation of the plan of redemption in the Gospel the angelic creation became *enlightened* as well as *subject to Christ*. This interpretation has been supported by all the acuteness and erudition which the recent Foreign School could bestow upon it, especially by Ernesti, Justinus, Grulich, Noesselt, and Heinr., which last mentioned Commentator gives the following sketch of the subject matter from ver. 15 to 19. “1. Maximâ quin divinâ majestate exsplendescit J. C. in omni creaturâ morali primus, ver. 15.; 2. Collegit is sibi societatem undique, quæ ex ipsius mente Deum veneraretur, fundavitque regnum morale, v. 16.; 3. Huic ipse (nemo alius) præest, in omnibus faciliè princeps, v. 17—19.; 4. Ex omnibus autem gentibus sine ullo discrimine collegit sibi cultores, v. 20.; 5. Atqui eodem honore dignatus est et vos, cujus pretium persentiscetis, dummodo firmos vos geritis et constantes.” All this, to say the least, is extremely plausible, and there is much to countenance the opinion. Inasmuch that even some very orthodox divines seem inclined to adopt it, observing that *other* and unexceptionable proofs remain of the divinity of Christ, and that (as Mr. Slade remarks) even from the figurative sense the same inference may be fairly deduced; for he who could so newly create the heavens and the earth, as to bring them, by his power, into an universal subjugation to himself, can hardly be imagined as less than divine.” This may be true; but I cannot without regret contemplate the wanton profusion and recklessness with which important evidences of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel are squandered, as if our stores were inexhaustible. Let it be remembered, that when Commentators admit certain doctrines in a general way, and yet can scarcely ever find them in any specific passage, their belief in them is, to say the least, very equivocal. As an instance in point, I need only refer to the case of the excellent Dr. Macknight, who, though he always continued in the profession of Calvinism, yet hardly *any* where espouses those peculiar interpretations on which Calvinism is founded. Who, then, can suppose him to have been really a Calvinist? The application is obvious: and

the spirit with which important evidences are thus thoughtlessly squandered away, is much to be deprecated. I cannot, therefore, but add my humble mite of praise (little as it is needed) to the efforts of one venerable Prelate, who in reference to a long controverted passage, has had the courage to make such a stand against the whole phalanx of Verbal Critics (who, in accordance with certain Critical Canons more applicable to Classical than Sacred Criticism, had cancelled the passage,) as has made even the most decided and able supporters of the new opinion *pause*, and others *sing their παλινωδία*. It is an important remark of Whitby, that this exposition of the passage respecting a true and proper creation of all things by Jesus Christ, is by the Father, from the beginning, laid down as a rule to which the Orthodox, keeping close, might show that the Hereticks, who held that the world was created by angels, deviated from the truth. On the present occasion, then, I see no sufficient reason to abandon the common interpretation, which yields an unobjectionable sense; and as to the *context*, it must be remembered, that in so irregular a writer as St. Paul even *that* is a principle of no very certain application. As to the *parallel passages* which are so confidently appealed to, they are, most of them, *not really such*, or at least doubtful; and in the interpretation of them the *present* passage is appealed to, which is really reasoning in a circle. Besides, the exposition in question, though it may be justified as far as concerns *κτίζειν* from the *usus loquendi*, yet in other respects it involves *greater difficulties* than the common one. This, however, will better appear from the following examination of the passage in detail.

15. ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου. The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that the sense is: "who (i. e. Christ) is (in his human nature) the visible image of the invisible God." Here the antient Commentators deserve attentive examination, especially Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen. My limits will only permit me to insert a short extract or two. Theodoret: Ἐναργεῖς γὰρ φέρει τοῦ γεγεννηκότος τοὺς χαρακτῆρας. And again: ἔστι τοίνυν εἰκὼν δηλοῦσα τὸ ὁμοούσιον· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄψυχοι εἰκόνες οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν οὐσίαν τούτων ὥσπερ εἰκόνες εἰσὶν. ἡ δὲ ζῶσα εἰκὼν, καὶ τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχουσα, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει φύσιν τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ. Theophyl.: τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἑντισμον, καὶ τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ μονογενοῦς τίθησιν ἐνταῦθα· εἰκὼν, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐκοῦν ἀπαράλλακτος. And again: εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἦν εἰκὼν, εἶχες τι λέγειν, ὅτι ἡ οἰκὼν οὐ φθάνει πρὸς τὸ πρωτότυπον. Ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰκὼν ἐστὶν ὡς Θεὸς καὶ Θεοῦ υἱός, ἀπαράλ-

λακτος καὶ εἰκὼν ἐπὶ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου, ἀόρατος δηλαδὴ.

Whitby has here a very masterly annotation, in which, after refuting the frigid and jejune interpretation of the Socinians, who maintain that Christ is called the image of the invisible God, because he, by his Gospel, hath made known to us the will of God, offers the following exposition: "Christ is the image of God, as making him who is invisible in his essence, conspicuous to us by the Divine works he wrought, they being such as plainly shewed, that in him *dwelt the fulness of the God-head bodily*; for an invisible God can only be seen by his effects of power, wisdom, and goodness, by which, says the Apostle, *from the Creation of the World the invisible things of God, to wit, his power and God-head, have been made known by the things that are made*, Rom. 1, 20. He, therefore, who in the Works both of the Old and New Creation, has given us such clear declarations of the Divine power, and wisdom, and goodness, is upon this account as much an image of God as anything can be; to this sense the image of God here seems necessarily restrained by the connective Particle ὅτι, he is the image of God, *for by him all things were created*. Moreover, that this place is parallel to that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the words sufficiently declare; here he is *the image of God*, there *the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person*; here he is the *first-born*, or Lord of every creature, there *the heir of all things*; here it is said *that all things were created by him*, there that he *made the World*; here that *by him all things do consist*, and there that *he supporteth all things by the word of his power*; now, that there he is styled *the image of God's glory, and the character of his person*, by reason of that Divine power, wisdom, and majesty, which shined forth in his actions, Schlictingius is forced to confess. It is not, therefore, to be doubted that he is here styled *the image of God* in the same sense." The learned Commentator also thinks it highly

probable that he is called the *image of the invisible God*, as appearing to the Patriarchs, and representing to them that God, who lives *in light inaccessible, to which no mortal eye can approach*. And in this sense Christ said to Philip, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." And St. Paul elsewhere says of Christ, with respect to the Father, that he is the radiance of His glory. The above opinion was maintained by the Antinicensian Fathers, and is somewhat countenanced by Chrys., Œcumen., and Theophyl. But it is involved in some difficulties, on which see the note on Hebr. 2, 2.

15. *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*. On the interpretation of this word (which the Apostle evidently employs in an unusual sense) there are many difficulties attendant: for the best interpretations have little of actual authority in their favour. The most natural, and probably best founded one, is that of the early Fathers, and the Greek Commentators, who take it to signify *begotten before the existence of any created being*; like *πρώτος* in Joh. 1, 15 & 30. So Theodoret: *ἄλλως τε οὐδὲ πρωτόκτιστον αὐτὸν εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀλλὰ πρωτότοκον, τουτέστι πρῶτον· οὕτω καὶ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν· πρῶτος γὰρ ἀνέστη*. And so Dr. Wells, who paraphrases: "The same second person in the Holy Trinity may also be styled the *first-born of every creature*, namely, as in respect of his divine nature, he was begotten of the Father before all creatures, and, as to his human nature, he was the first that was raised from the dead, never to die again." Another, and also well founded interpretation, is propounded by Whitby, who, after having thoroughly refuted the shallow inference of the Socinians, that from this passage it must appear that Christ is in the number of creatures, maintains that he is so styled as being the Lord of all things. And he compares the phrase in a parallel passage, *κληρόνομος πάντων*, and proves, from the antients, that *Heir* and *Lord* were terms interchangeable. He concludes a long and able defence of this interpreta-

tion, by saying, that we may conceive the person of whom David was a type, may be also here styled the *first-born*, as being Prince over, and high above all creatures, they being all the work of his hands. In the language of the Rabbins, too (as we learn from Michaelis), God is called the first-born of the world. This interpretation is also adopted by Schleus. and Jaspis. And though it has been objected by Bp. Middleton, that thus Christ would be said to be the eldest born of his own creation, which (he observes) would be absurd; yet I here desiderate the usual judgment and good taste of the learned Prelate; for it were injudicious, and even unwarrantable to thus press on the consistency of a figure in so little regular a writer as St. Paul.

The truth seems to lie between these two interpretations.* Which to prefer I know not. Perhaps they may be united. Bp. Middleton engrafts on the former the following interpretation: "He was the first offspring of that great and glorious scheme, formed in the eternal counsel of God for the restoration of a fallen world." This may be true in *doctrine*, but it cannot be proved to be *the* truth intended by the Apostle.

16. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. It cannot be denied that *κτίζειν* is sometimes used of a moral or evangelical creation. But for the reasons above assigned, and because (as Whitby says) not one instance can be shown where the creation of all things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, is ever used in a moral sense, or concerning any other creation than the natural, this cannot be here admitted. Mr. Slade (partly from Abp. Magee and Dr. Nares) truly observes, that the terms are so general and explicit, that they cannot properly be limited in this manner. The Apostle

* For as to others, they have not the semblance of it; ex. gr. that of Isidore, Erasm., and Michaelis, who accentuate *πρωτότοκος*, thus taking the word in an *active* sense; which is liable to insuperable objections, both grammatical and doctrinal.

may be understood as illustrating and establishing the sovereignty of Christ over the new creation, by the circumstance of his being Creator and King of all the beings and powers in heaven and in earth. The interpretation in question is indeed so frigid, forced, and unnatural, nay, even (as Whitby says) flat and mean, that one would wonder how so many able Commentators could have been induced to adopt it, except from mere fondness for hypothesis. Whitby has (I think) unanswerably shewn the felicity of it, and his chief reasons are these: 1st., the Apostle here speaks of the creation of such things as are not capable of a moral creation: since *all* must comprehend inanimate substances; and to the *Angels*, whether the good or the bad, it can by no means apply.* 2dly., the words in this sense were far from being true when the Apostle spoke them; for only a very *small remnant* of the Jews were then converted to the Christian Faith, and of the Gentiles few, in comparison of those multitudes which afterwards embraced the Faith; and yet the Apostle plainly speaks of a creation wholly past already. 3dly., The Apostle *afterwards* enters upon the moral creation, at ver. 18, 19 & 20. (as it should seem, engrafting it upon the other Edit.). Now these things being thus connected by the Particle *καί*, to what he had before said of the creation of all things by Christ, demonstratively show that he was not then speaking of that revelation, which he begins to speak of in these following words.

16. τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, "created by God through him, as *instrumental cause*." Εἰς αὐτὸν, "for his governance, and for the manifestation of his power and wisdom therein."

17. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ πρὸ πάντων, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε. This is evidently a further developement

* So Bp. Pearson on the Creed, who, in his luminous exposition of this text, shows that the verb *κρίζειν*, as applied to the angels, must be understood of their *original creation*; they could not be said to be *created anew*.

of the same thought as that of the preceding verse. Here the supporters of the new interpretation are put to great straits. First they interpret *προ*, not of *pre-existence* but of *supereminence*, an interpretation, they think, required by the following words. Doddr. expresses *both*. But the *former* interpretation deserves the preference. And so Theophyl., who remarks, that the Apostle does not say, *was* before all, but *is*, as being especially appropriate to the Deity. Nor can the words *καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε*, without great harshness, be interpreted of the *moral preservation, governance* of, &c.; q. d. “not only the Jews and Gentiles are become *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα ἐν* (Eph. 2, 14, 16.), but all the various orders of beings will together be subject to Christ, as one harmonized whole:” a sense for which there is no good authority: whereas of that of *create* there are abundance of examples, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, which may be seen in the Commentators, or Schleus. Lex. The sense is: “were created, and are preserved. So Theodoret: *Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐστὶν ἀπάντων δημιουργὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ προμηθεῖται ὧν ἐποίησε, καὶ κυβερνᾷ τὴν κτίσιν.*

18. *καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος.* The Apostle now engrafts on the *natural creation* of all things by Christ another view, in which he alludes to the moral or *evangelical creation*. So Theophyl. observes, that having spoken of the dignity of the Son, he now speaks of his condescending humanity. And Theodoret remarks: *ἀπὸ τῆς Θεολογίας εἰς τὴν οἰκονομίαν μετέβη.*

The sense is: “And (moreover) he is the head of the body of the Church (He), who is the beginning, or author of the Church, the first-born, or Lord of the dead.” The comparison in *κεφαλὴ*, &c. is frequent; as *infra* ver. 24, 2, 19.; Eph. 4, 15 & 16., 1 Cor. 11, 3. Christ is here said to be the *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, as at 1 Cor. 15, 20., he is called *ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων*. By the *ἐκκλησία*, is meant

(Theophyl. observes), the whole race of men. And so Est. and Mackn.

18. ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων. The recent Commentators take the ἵνα in the *eventual* sense ; which, however, seems not very necessary. Πρωτεύειν, in the sense *to be first*, is frequent both in the Sept. and the Classical writers ; and is used of Kings, Princes, and Governors. At πᾶσι, some supply πράγμασι ; others, ἀνθρώποις. The latter method is preferable ; but both may be included. And so Theophyl. explains : ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν θεωρουμένοις. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ πρὸ πάντων γεγένηται ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πρῶτος πάντων ἐστίν, ὡς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ πρὸ πάντων ἀνέστη, χαριζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, ὡς ἀπαρχή.

19. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι.

There is some little ambiguity and obscurity about this sentence, which may, perhaps, be imputed to the awful nature of the subject treated on. The recent Commentators here propose several novel modes of interpretation, which, however, effect so considerable a change in what has been, from the earliest ages, the received interpretation, that I cannot venture to place much confidence in it. The general rules of Grammarians and Critics ought indeed to be applied with great caution in cases like the present, where there is no reason to think that the Apostle had any thing of that sort in view, and in which the *subject matter* rather than the *words* themselves must be attended to. I see no reason to desert the opinion of the antients, and most moderns, that at εὐδόκησε must be supplied ὁ Θεὸς. The sense is : “ For in him (God) was pleased that all the fullness (of perfection and government) should dwell ;” as Gal. 1, 15. See also Rom. 15, 26. Theophyl. explains : τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, τουτέστιν, εἶτι ἦν ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ Λόγος, ἐκεῖ ᾤκησεν, οὐκ ἐνέργεια τις, ἀλλ’ οὐσία. Οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ἄλλην εἰπεῖν αἰτίαν, εἰ μὴ τὴν εὐδοκίαν καὶ τὴν θέλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Rosenm. (partly from Noesselt) gives the following explanation of πλήρωμα : “ *Plenitudo* activè et passivè accipitur, i. e. de iis quæ implent, dant, docent, aut quæ capiunt aliquid, possident, eoque ornati sunt vel imbuti, sive de copiâ quacunque, Joh. 1, 16., Rom. 11, 25 & 12. Hoc loco intelligitur de dotibus, quas Deus Christo concesserat, imprimisque de cognitione Dei quàm tradere hominibus, doctrinâque cœlesti, quâ vim monstrare ad veram animi salutem deberet, f. 2, 9.” The subject, however, is more solidly and fully treated on by Whitby, thus : “ The great end of our Saviour’s sufferings was to rescue our bodies, condemned for sin to death, from that mortality, and to bestow on all whom God should give him, eter. life, by raising of

their bodies to a state of incorruption. So Hebr. 2, 14 & 15. Therefore the Church which is his body, is represented as the Church of the *first-born enrolled in heaven*, Hebr. 12, 23., a Church against which the *Gates of Hades*, or of Death, shall not prevail to hinder their enjoyment of this resurrection to a life of happiness; they are the sons of God, and therefore *children of the resurrection*, Luke 21, 36., therefore *heirs of God*, joint heirs with Christ, who shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, v. 21., shall have the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body, ver. 23, and they are also represented as persons fore-ordained to be conformed to the image of Christ, by having *their vile bodies changed into the likeness of Christ's glorious body*, ver. 29. Note, 2dly., That to this end was Christ raised, that he the *first-born from the dead*, might raise up his whole body from the dead, he being raised from the dead as the *first-fruits of them that slept*, 1 Cor. 15, 20., for to this end Christ both died and rose again, that he might be the Lord both of the dead, and of the living, Rom. 14, 9., and God hath therefore exalted him, that at the name (i. e. the power) of Jesus, *every knee should bow, of things in heaven, in the earth, and under the earth*, Philip. 2, 10., that is, the bodies of the dead: for by this argument, and from these very words, the Apostle proves the resurrection, and a future judgment, Rom. 14, 10, 11, 12. He is, therefore, so the *first-born of the dead*, as to be the Lord of them, according to our former interpretation of the word *first-born*, as to have power to raise them up who sleep in him, and bring them with him, 1 Thess. 4, 14., to give eternal life unto them, and raise them up at the last day, Joh. 5, 28, 29., 17, 2. And thus hath he the pre-eminence in all things, being Lord of all creatures, dead and living, and giving both their first and their new being to them, and rendering his members conformable to his glorious image, that so they may be joint heirs with him in glory."

20. καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι—οὐρανοῖς. Here must be repeated εὐδόκησε ὁ Θεός. The words τὰ πάντα—εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς have not a little exercised the Commentators. The best founded opinion seems to be that of Hamm. and the most eminent Interpreters since his times, that the neuter gender is here put for the masculine, as often: and that by τὰ πάντα, as far as regards the τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, may be understood *Jews and Gentiles*. See the long note of Hamm. They might have added, that γέννη is here understood.

Ἀποκαταλλάξαι is a very strong term, and imports far more than καταλλ. Whether by αὐτὸν be meant God, or Christ, Commentators are not agreed. The *latter* seems to be the best founded opinion;

but both may be admitted. This “complete reconciliation,” it is said, was effected, and peace restored, by *the blood of his cross*, i. e. by the blood of his body shed on the cross.

On the meaning of *τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς* there is some difference of opinion, on which I beg to refer the reader to Wolf’s *Curæ*. I must confess, that upon the whole, I see no opinion so probable as that of the antient Commentators and Dr. Whitby, which is embraced by Dr. Doddr., the former of whom renders: “and by him to make all things friendly in him, making peace between them by the blood of his cross.” And in his note he observes, that whilst man continued in his obedience to God, angels and men were in a perfect friendship, but when men became disobedient to their Sovereign Lord, the angels became averse to them, because their Lord was dishonoured by them: but God being reconciled unto us by the death of his Son, they also became friends and ministering spirits to us, and we became of the same Church and body with them, under the same head Christ Jesus, Heb. 12, 22. *And so all things in heaven and earth were gathered into one Christ.* Eph. 1, 10.

21. καὶ ὑμᾶς πότε—τοῖς πονηροῖς. What he had said of Jesus Christ the Apostle now applies to the state of the Colossians, as formerly Gentiles, and now Christians. (Heinr.)

Ἀπηλλοτριωμένους, “aliens from God, and consequently alienated or separated from, deprived of, the divine promises and benefits.” Compare Tit. 3, 3. Eph. 2, 12. 4, 18. where see the note. The words *ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ* are exegetical of the preceding. See Rom. 5, 10. The *διανοία* is justly regarded by the antient Commentators as a strong term denoting deliberate and purposed enmity. It must, at least, indicate that it was deeply seated, namely, in the thoughts as well as the affections, and developing itself in evil works. Ἐν, *in, by*; like the Hebr. ב.

21. νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν. The δὲ is by Beza ren-

dered *sanè omnino*. I prefer, however, our Common Version *yet*; for the participle seems to have what may be called a hypoadversative force.

22. ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. These words are by some considered as pleonastic. Yet they impart great energy to the sentence. Besides, there seems to be an allusion to the other and *glorified* nature now enjoyed by Christ in the union of the Godhead. Others explain the *σωμ.* as denoting the *body of the Church* into which they were now incorporated. But nothing can be more harsh or far-fetched.

At παραστήσαι must be understood εἰς τὸ, which signifies the end and purpose. Theophyl. compares this with the ἱκανώσαντι ἡμᾶς a little before; q. d. "He hath not only liberated us from sin, but likewise bestowed holiness, not of a common sort, but pure and irreprehensible." Compare Eph. 5, 27. (and the note) and 2, 13—18. and the notes.

23. εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἐδραῖοι. The εἴ γε carries with it an éllipsis, as: "And thus it will be with you, if indeed, &c. Τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἐδραῖοι, "grounded and founded, and therefore stable." See the note on the parallel passage of Eph. 3, 17., to which I would add, that there is a masterly criticism on the passage by Phot. in his Epist. p. 238. Montac. The whole Epistle will repay an attentive perusal, and is highly characteristic of the acuteness and consummate erudition of that extraordinary man.

23. καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. This is expressed with popular brevity. The sense is: "not shaken or removed from the hope of the benefits revealed by the Gospel." The μετὰ has reference to the *change* to other opinions and the taking up of other hopes. Thus in the Classical writers it is applied to the changing of governments, or altering of compacts. And Schleus. remarks that in Theodotion's translation of 1 Sam. 2, 30. μετακινούμενοι is used of those who suffer themselves to be

drawn this way and that by persuasions, ac aurâ sunt leviores. It is probable that the Apostle might have that passage in view, and that the word might have place in some copies of the *Sept.* then extant.

23. κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. By κτίσις. is, of course, meant the *moral creation*, i. e. every nation under heaven. This is regarded by most Commentators as a popular hyperbole for *most nations*, or for *Jews and Gentiles*. Which, however, is little necessary. It is probable there was scarcely *any one* civilized nation of the then known world to which the Gospel had not been promulgated. See the note supra ver. 15.

24—29. Here (Theophyl. remarks,) there may appear an inconsequence, but there is, in fact, none. For, after having said, “I am a minister of the Gospel, from which I conjure you not to swerve,” he shows, that so true is this, that he even *suffers for it*, nay even rejoices in his sufferings, especially as being calculated for their benefits. Here St. Paul, as in other Epistles sent from Rome, when in captivity, introduces a mention of his bonds. This was, in the present case, suggested by the word διάκονον, *that* recalling to his mind the *cause* for which he was suffering this misery, of which he felt proud, and which was the source of great joy; since his doctrines were calculated to reform the morals of, and to confer temporal and eternal happiness on all who embraced them.

24. νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, “Now I rejoice at these my sufferings (which are thus) for you, and your benefit.” Καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ—αὐτοῦ. Heinr. would take the καὶ for καὶ γὰρ. But this is too arbitrary. The Apostle seems to have intended the χαίρω to be here understood for χαίρω ἀναπληρῶν, “I rejoice, I say, at filling up,” &c. As to ἀνταναπλ., it is regarded by almost all modern Commentators as put for the simple ἀναπλ. But this is a principle which I am always slow to admit, especially in writers so little pleonastic as St. Paul.

Such pleonasms (as I have before observed) are usually to be ascribed to our ignorance. Perhaps the *ἀνα* may signify *vicissim, on my part*. See Wolf's *Curæ*. The verb *ἀνταναπλ.* is somewhat rare; yet it has been adduced from some of the later Greek writers by Alberti and Wets.

The words following τὰ ὑστερήματα are very energetic, and to be ascribed to the high wrought feelings of the Apostle on a subject so interesting to him. In considering them, the antients and the early moderns have (I think) taken a far more correct view than the recent Commentators (whose speculations will be found in *Heinr.*). See *Chrys.*, *Theophyl.*, *Œcumen.*, and *Theodoret*, from whom *Whitby* remarks, that "Christ having told us that what is done to his members, is done to him, *Matt.* 25, 40 and 45, the afflictions of his members are styled the persecutions and afflictions of Christ, *Acts* 9, 4 & 5." "Now the Jews (continues he) speak much of the afflictions of Christ and his disciples, comprehending both under the name of חבלי המשיח, *the afflictions of the Messiah*." The Apostle (as *Doddr.* observes) could not mean that the sufferings of Christ were imperfect as to that fulness of *atonement* which was necessary to the *justification* of believers (or require, as the Romanists say, the addition of the sufferings of the saints, *Edit.*); but he deeply retained in his mind the impression of that first lesson which he had from his Saviour's mouth, viz. that *he* was persecuted in his members (*Acts* 9, 4.); he therefore considers it as the plan of Providence, that a certain measure of sufferings should be endured by this body, of which Christ was the Head; and he rejoices to think that what *he* endured in *his own person* was congruous to that wise and gracious scheme." See also *Mackn.*

25. κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν—ὅμᾶς. The Apostle now drops the image by which the Church is compared to a *body*, and uses terms suited to a *house*, to which indeed the Church is compared in *1 Tim.* 3, 15.

Now over this *house* God presides as supreme οἰκόνομος (οἰκονομία Θεοῦ), but also commits this οἰκονομία to others, as here to Paul (τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι), and these are called διακόνοι. (Heinr.)

The sense is, "according to the dispensation of God given unto me." Εἰς ὑμᾶς, "for your benefit." This is put instead of a dativus commodi. Or (with Heinr.) it may be construed with πληρῶσαι, which must have εἰς τὸ supplied. Many Commentators take πληρῶσαι in the sense διδάσκειν. But it imports something more, namely, *fully* teach and promulgate; as Rom. 15, 19.* The antients rightly considered this as having reference to that fuller instruction which the Gentiles needed.

27. οἷς ἠθέλησεν — ἔθνεσιν, "to whom God was pleased to make known what are the glorious riches and preciousness of this mystery among the Heathens." The ἠθέλ. indicates (as Theophyl. observes) the good pleasure of God in making it known to whom he will. One cannot but notice, with Theophyl., the exuberance (ὀγκος) of the phraseology with which St. Paul expatiates on this interesting point. Thus the terms πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης, which signify *richly glorious*, are highly impressive.

Some recent Commentators, as Heinr. and Rosenm., take the ὅς for ὃ, and refer it to μυστήριον. It is usually referred to πλοῦτον, which seems preferable: but it may refer to *both*, by the πρὸς τὸ σημαίν., though only accommodated in gender to *one*. So Theophyl.: ἐρμηνεύων τί τὸ πλοῦτος, καὶ τί τὸ μυστήριον, ὃ Χριστὸς, φησὶν, ἥτοι ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώσις, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν.

The words following are added, Theophyl. observes, μετὰ ἐγκωμίων, and in order thereby to draw them from angel-worship. Χριστὸς is by Theoph. well explained the ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώσις, the Christian doc-

* So Rosenm. explains it, "perfectè et cum prospero successu docere, quæ plenior institutio in eo erat, quod Gentiles etiam ad societatem Christianam admittendos et perducendos esse doceret."

trine. The *μυστήριον* is explained by Theodoret, “that the heathens sitting in darkness have received the riches of divine knowledge, the *φιλοτιμίαν τὴν τῆς δόξης*. The *ἐλπις τῆς δόξης* is explained by the recent Commentators the *cause* of the hope of. But I prefer, with the antients, to take *ἐλπ. τ. δ.* for *τὴν προσδοκωμένην δόξαν*. Of course, *δόξ.* denotes the felicity laid up for Christians in heaven.

28. *νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον, καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον*, “whom, (i. e. his doctrine,) we preach and promulgate, admonishing every man (of whatever nation) of its claim to attention, and teaching every man who attends to the admonition, the duties it enjoins.” Such appears to be the true sense; for I cannot think with some recent Commentators, that the terms *νουθετ.* and *διδάσκ.* are synonymous. Even Heinr. acknowledges that the former may relate to the *morals*, and the latter to the *understanding*. So Theophyl.: *Νοήσεις δὲ νουθεσίαν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς πράξεως· διδασκαλίαν δὲ ἐπὶ δογματῶν*. The *πάντα* is thought to be emphatic, and *ἄνθρωπον* to be put for *men*, i. e. men of every nation. Others take *ἄνθρ.* to denote *man*. But perhaps in the Hellenistic and popular style *πάντα ἄνθρωπον* may be merely a stronger expression than *τινα*.

The words *πάντα ἄνθρωπον* after *διδ.* are omitted in several antient MSS., some Fathers, Versions, and early Editions; perhaps rightly: but this is a question of no easy determination.

28. *ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, in all wisdom*. See the note supra ver. 9 and infra 2, 3. Theophyl. explains this not only of that of the Scriptures, but of the art of reasoning and a knowledge of Greek literature. *Παραστήσωμεν, present*; as courtiers do any one to a sovereign, or great man. See supra ver. 22. *Τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ*, i. e. (as the best Commentators explain) “possessed of a perfect knowledge of Christ and the Gospel, and exercised in the duties it enjoins.” “It must be observed (says Photius) that such was his *object*; if few comparatively would listen to his ex-

hortations, and still fewer put them in practice to the extent he wished, it was not his fault." Some recognize in παραστ. and τέλειον sacrificial metaphors. But this is perhaps too fanciful.

29. εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ, ἀγωνιζόμενος—ἐν δυνάμει. These are very strong terms; and the passage may be thus rendered: "For which (purpose) also I strenuously labour, according to His energy who operates in me powerfully." The ἀγωνιζ. (which is an agonistical term) is intensive of the κοπιῶ. See 1 Tim. 4, 10., and on the whole verse compare Phil. 4, 13.

CHAP. II.

Ceasing to speak of himself, the Apostle now turns to the Colossians, admonishing them to abide constantly by the pure and genuine Christian instructions which they had received from Epaphras, and not suffer themselves to be led away by any of the preposterous inventions of fraudulent teachers. An admonition, on account of the many errors of doctrine with which they were carried to and fro (see Prolegomena), especially necessary. Now this the Apostle urges with the greater warmth, as he had not *himself* instructed them (any more than the Laodiceans, Hieropolitans, &c.), and with his admonitions he now and then mixes detestations of those adversaries who were striving to lead them away from the true path of Christ. This disputation extends to the end of the chapter, and proceeds in the following order: 1. It has given me much pain to hear how you are carried away with false opinions, and certainly there is nothing I more earnestly wish, than that you, and all whom I have not been able to admonish and instruct in person, may be confirmed in the doctrine of Christ, so infinitely more sublime than all human inventions, ver. 1—3. 2. Do not, then, commit yourselves to those wily persons, but keep firm and constant to Christ, ver. 4—8. 3. For he is worthy of being embraced, and his transcendent merits ever held in reverence and admiration, ver. 9—15. Henceforth shun every thing that is abhorrent to the pure doctrine of this Teacher, ver. 16—fin. (Hein.)

VERSE 1. θέλω γὰρ—Λαοδικεία. The γὰρ has reference to the ἀγωνιζόμενος in the preceding verse, and (as Rosenm. observes) it suggests a *reason* why the Colossians should remain constant in the performance of their Christian duties. Ἠλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω. These words (which are explained by Theoph.

ἀγωνιῶ περὶ ὑμῶν) express the strong solicitude of the Apostle with respect to the Colossians and Laodiceans, especially on account of the dangers they were in from the arts of wily seducers, and seem to *imply* a desire of seeing them, to avert that danger.

On Laodiceæ, the capital of Phrygia Pacatiana, see Strabo, Pliny, and the other authorities adduced by Wets.

1. καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακάσι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί. These words are well paraphrased by Theodoret: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν μηδέπω με τεθεαμένων. The expression ἑωρ. τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί is a mere Hebraism, which ought not to be too much pressed upon. The ὅσοι, &c. signifies, “and as many other churches in your province as have not yet seen me.” It is well observed by Theoph., that the Apostle adds Laodiceæ and others, to spare their feelings in the censures he has to introduce.

2. ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν. Some Commentators interpret the παρακλ. of *consolation*; others, of *admonition*. Much may be said in support of either interpretation. *Admonition* and *confirmation* would be necessary to produce that comfort and tranquillity which had been interrupted by the dissensions introduced by rival teachers; to which purpose it was necessary συμβιβάζειν, “to bring them together,” and thus close up the schism. On συμβ. see the note on Eph. 4, 16.* For συμβιβασθέντων some MSS. read συμβιβασθέντες. Both expressions are anomalous, but the common one seems the more genuine, as being the harsher. Heinr. says it may be resolved into ἵνα συμβιβασθῶσιν. But αὐτῶν might rather be repeated. The irregularity arose from the Apostle’s saying “*their hearts*,” for *they*.

The ἐν ἀγάπῃ is said to be for δι’ ἀγάπης, as showing the *bond* by which all, being reconciled and

* Of this sense of the word Wets. has numerous examples; as Thucyd. 8, 29. ξυνεβίβασε δὲ τὸν Περδίκκαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. Herod. 1, 74. οἱ δὲ συμβιβάσαντες αὐτοὺς ἔσαν οἶδε. Dio Exc. p. 617. ἐπέμφη γὰρ ὡς συμβιβάσων αὐτοὺς τοῖς ὁμοχώροις—διαφερομένους.

brought together, might resist the attacks of adversaries.

2. καὶ εἰς πάντα πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως. Heinr. remarks, that as ἐν has shown the *instrument*, so εἰς denotes the *scope* and *end* to which they were to be united, namely, that their minds might be imbued with knowledge far more elevated than the false teachers devised. And in order to heighten the δεινότης, he, instead of εἰς πάντα or εἰς πλήρη συνέσιν, says εἰς πληροφορίαν τῆς συνέσεως, and, what is yet *more*, εἰς πάντα πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως. Then, by apposition, he at εἰς ἐπιγ. τοῦ μυστηρίου adds the *cause* for which he could ascribe πλουτ. and πληροφ. to Christian knowledge, namely, inasmuch as it leads us to understand the μυστήριον, or divine decree for blessing men by Christ, hitherto hidden. See supra 1, 26. As an example of πλοῦτος in the above sense I would cite Jambl. de V. Pyth. § 67. πραπίδων πλοῦτον.

Ἐπίγνωσις signifies here, as often, an *exacter knowledge*.

2. καὶ πατὴρ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. From the diversity of readings found in the MSS., the Critics are inclined to regard the whole clause as spurious. A conclusion as rash and groundless as such usually are. The true reading it is neither very easy nor very material to determine. On these words see Wolf's *Curæ* and especially Whitby.

3. ἐν ᾧ εἰσι πάντες—ἀπόκρυφοι. It is strange that many recent Commentators should refer the ἐν ᾧ to μυστηρίου; which method, indeed, yields a tolerable sense, but (as Wolf observes) not so good a one as arises by referring it to Χριστοῦ, with the antients and most moderns, and recently Heinrichs. It respects (as Whitby observes) the person of Christ as Mediator, the knowledge of whom, the Apostle says, hath an excellency beyond all other knowledge, Philip. 3, 8. for ἐν ᾧ περιετμήθητε, *in whom ye are circumcised*, ver. 11. and ἐν ᾧ, *in whom ye are risen again*, ver. 12. plainly relate to Christ's person and his merits as Me-

diator ; and the whole of the following chapter treats of him, and of the benefits we have received ἐν αὐτῷ *by him*. The Apostle also applies this to him by saying (ver. 6.) *as you received the Lord Jesus Christ, so walk in him* ; and by warning us against the deceit of vain philosophy, because *in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead*.* Heinr. however takes Χρ. to signify the *doctrine* of Christ ; which, (Whitby observes,) will make no great difference, since these hidden treasures of Christ's wisdom are revealed to us by his Gospel only, and thence alone we obtain all our knowledge of him as our Mediator, and of all the offices he sustains as such.

3. οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. A similitude taken from a money-chest, from whence the cash is taken when needed. See Macc. 1, 24. Θεσ. denotes (as Theophyl. remarks) the abundance of the knowledge ; and the πάντες its boundlessness. The ἀπόκρ., too, implies that he alone knoweth, and therefore from *Him* we are to seek wisdom and knowledge. The ἐν ᾧ, too, denotes his self-derived wisdom and knowledge.*

4. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω—πιθανολογία. In the preceding verse there seems to be an allusion to the false teachers ; as appears plainly from the present verse, which is introduced by the formula τοῦτο λέγω, which always imports an injunction to great attention. Here, however, it has a somewhat different sense ; and λέγω seems to be a vox prægnans ; q. d. " This I say, meaning that," &c. Παραλογισ. is a word often used in the Classical writers ; and joined with ἐξαπατᾶν and other similar words ; it signifies to *deceive* and *circumvent*, to *come round* (παρὰ) any one by false pretences, and, in a general way, to *deceive* ;

* As the philological Commentators adduce nothing on these words, the following passages may be acceptable. Eurip. Alcest. 6, 14. Wakef. ἐν τοῖς ἀγάθοις δὲ παντ' ἐνέστι σοφίας (δώρα). I must also subjoin (what is singular) an imitation (for such I take it to be) of this passage by the Apostate Julian, in his Hymn in Solem 2. ἀναλάβοντι σοφίας ἀνοιξαι θησαύρους.

as here, for *πιθανολογία* is added, which signifies a specious and *taking* sort of address, adapted to persuade and bring over those with whom it is employed. Theophyl. explains: Τί γὰρ εἰ πιθανῶς λέγει; οὐδὲν οἶδε, παραλογισμός ἐστι τὸ πᾶν, καὶ σοφίσματα. On this term may be compared the similar one *χρηστολογία* at Rom. 16, 18. Loesner aptly cites Philo 4, 14. C. οἵτινες ὡήθησαν σοφίαν πιθανῶν εἶναι λόγων εὐρεσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πραγμάτων ἀληθεστάτην πίστιν· and 338 E. τὴν τῶν λόγων πιθανότητα.

Rosenm. thinks these deceivers were persons who mingled together Judaism and Oriental philosophy.

5. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι. Compare a similar sentiment at 1 Cor. 5, 3. where see the note. Ἀλλὰ, *yet*; as 2 Cor. 11, 6. 13, 9.

5. χαίρων καὶ βλέπων. An Hendiadis for, “rejoicing while I see.” So Joseph. Bell. 3, 9, 2. (cited by Wets.) ὑμᾶς πρὸς τὸ παρὸν εὖ ἔχοντας χαίρω καὶ βλέπω. and Galen: ἴδων καὶ χαίρων. Τὴν τάξιν ὑμῶν, “your order and regularity,” εὐταξίαν (as Theophyl. explains). A military metaphor generally implying *discipline, obedience, and constancy*. So here, Heinr. thinks, it may have reference to *subordination* and obedience to the superior teachers, the order with which every thing was done (as in 1 Cor. 14, 40.); also the regular management of the funds for the relief of the poor; and especially constancy in adhering to the faith of Christ.” This last particular, however, does not seem adverted to in *these* words; but it is so especially in the words *following*, καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν.

6. ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χ. Ἰ. τ. Κ., ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, “As, therefore, ye have received the doctrine of Christ, walk, continue in it, and by it regulate your whole conduct.” Παραλαμβ. is used of teaching of every kind, both oral, and by letter. See 1 Cor. 11, 23. &c. Περιπατεῖν, as Heinr. remarks, here denotes not merely the *habitual regula-*

tion of the life, but continuance in doctrine; since the whole chapter is not ethical, but doctrinal.

7. ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι, “rooted and well founded* in it;” as Jude 20. Both these expressions are explained by the βεβαιούμενοι. See the note on the parallel passage of Eph. 3, 17. Heinr. observes, that καθὼς ἐδιδ. must be closely connected with πίστει; and περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, imports a progressive increase in faith and in performance of good works, as the fruits of it.” But the former seems all that is here intended; and συν εὐχαριστία signifies “with thankfulness to God for your conversion.” See 1, 12. and Ps. 100, 4.

8. βλέπετε μὴ τις—ἀπάτης, “See, mind lest.” So Matt. 24, 4. βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανώσῃ. The verb in this sense has usually after it a negative particle, or an ἀπὸ. Ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν, is said to be for συλαγωγῇ, perhaps by a sort of Hebraism. Yet there seems more of energy and emphasis. Συλαγωγεῖν signifies literally to carry off spoils or booty. *Making a spoil of you* may therefore import either, “treating you as things to be sacked, and spoiling your Christian goods;” or, “carrying you away with them, as the sacker carries off the inhabitants as a booty.” The former seems preferable. Theophyl. thinks (as also Dounæus) that there is an allusion to a thief who privily digs his way into a house, and steals the property.

8. διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης. This is considered by most Commentators as an hendiadis, for “sophistical and fallacious philosophy.”† For the

* Like the immense stones without cement which formed the foundations of the edifices of the antients. See the note on Eph. 3, 17., to which may be added a passage of Demophilus, cited by Bulkley on Joh. 15, 5. ῥιζωθέντες ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ φυέντες, &c. Having been rooted and sprung up from God, let us adhere to our root; for like streams of water divided from their fountain, so the plants of the earth, cut off from their root, soon become withered, dry, and rotten.”

† The same interpretation is adopted by Schoettg., who has here a long and able annotation. Grot. observes, that the Apostle uses

Apostle (they say) does not *absolutely* condemn philosophy, but *κατὰ τι*, *comparatè*, i. e. out of its proper limits, and exercised upon matters which exceed its comprehension. But I rather apprehend that the Apostle means to censure the Grecian philosophy in general, which was altogether hostile to the Gospel, and could by no means be mixed with it, but to the detriment of the latter; especially since (as Heinr. observes) the term φιλοσοφία also denoted what we call *religion*, and is applied as such by Josephus and Philo to the *Jewish religion*.

As to the persons here meant, some (as Whitby observes) fix on Simon Magus and the Gnostics. Others, on the Jewish Doctors, who then mixed the philosophy of the Heathens with their ceremonial worship, and had learned to allegorize it. Others, again, divide the matter between Jews and Gentiles. "That the Jewish Doctors (continues he) are, in a great measure, adverted to, appears from ver. 14—16. This indeed seems the key of the following, which, may be distributed into two heads: 1. Cautions against the seductions of the Jews zealous for observation of their rites and ceremonies; 2. against the seductions of the Heathens by their vain philosophy dressed up by them anew, both as to its doctrines and morals, and set off with the most specious pretences, styled here πιθανολογία, *enticing speech*." See also Mackn. and especially Wolf's *Curæ*.

On the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, see the note on Gal. 4, 3.

9. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς.

The connexion is thus traced by Whitby: " (of which philosophy ye can have no need) since," &c. But this seems too arbitrary. It may

φιλοσοφ. because it was the received term; but by adding τῆς κενῆς ἀπατῆς he expresses its real nature; since it deceived many by professing to be what it was not, and promising what it did not perform. So that though the knowledge of it was not of itself bad, yet it was dangerous; and certainly after the Jews had studied philosophy, their antient doctrines were much corrupted.

be more closely traced thus : “ (And yet their philosophizing ought to be κατὰ Χριστὸν, as being Christians,) *for* in him dwelleth,” &c.

On the sense of the words the antient and modern interpreters exceedingly differ. The antients and earlier moderns recognise in them a strong evidence of the Deity of Christ; and they assign the following sense: “in whom the whole fulness of deity substantially dwells.” Of σωματικῶς there have been, even among the orthodox, three interpretations, which are thus stated by Wolf: 1. *corporally*, so that the body of Christ as a subject of habitation be signified; 2. *truly*, as indicating the *mode* of habitation; 3. *substantially*. The first is supported by Theodoret, Œcumen., and many moderns. The second is modified by some, so as to mean *solidly, really*, in opposition to *types* and *shadows*. So Glass, Hamm.,* Hackspan, Vitranga, and most Lutherans. The third interpretation is supported by many antients, Thus Theophyl.: τουτέστιν, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐνεργεῖα τις, ἀλλὰ οὐσία καὶ ὡς σωματῶθεις καὶ μία ἀπόστασις ὧν μετὰ τοῦ προσλήμματος. Ἡ καὶ οὕτω, κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Κυριλλον, ὡς ἂν ἐν σώματι ἐνοικήσῃ ψυχὴ ἐνοικεῖ δὲ αὐτῇ σώματι οὐσιωδῶς καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως, καὶ ἀφυτῶς, *substantially*, or *personally*. And so Bochart and Suic. Thes. 2, 1217. Wolf (rightly I think) is of opinion that all three interpretations (so that the word Θεὸς be taken of the *nature* of Christ) are so far from being adverse, that they are reconcilable, and arise one out of another. “Thus (continues he) the divine nature of Christ (or the λόγος) is said to *dwell* ; which necessarily supposes a *subject* for indwelling; and such is the *body*, or *human nature* of Christ. In that the λόγος dwelt, not by shadow, appearance, or figure, but truly and in presence. And if so, then not only ἐνεργητικῶς and *effectively*, but in *substance* and *essence*.”

The above seems, upon the whole, a correct representation of the sense. It is observed by Whitby, that the Apostle does not directly say, that *Christ is God*, but expresses his divine nature thus, partly to represent to the Jews the divinity of Christ, with allusion to the God of Israel dwelling in the Temple, partly to oppose him to the πλήρωμα of the Gnostics, and to the partial deities of the Heathens.”

We may (I think) conclude, with Whitby (adopting the words of the Council of Antioch), that the body born of the Virgin, receiving the whole fulness of the godhead bodily, was immutably united to the divinity, and deified, which made the same person, Jesus Christ,

* His words are these: “In Christ the deity dwells in fulness, so as nothing could be added to it, and so in him *bodily*, that is, as the sun dwells in the firmament, where the body of it is. The whole divine nature is not only in part, but fully, without absence of any part of it, in Christ; and that not by a *species*, or *image* only, but really and substantially: and so consequently, (which is the thing here designed to be proved by it) the will of God must be supposed to be so revealed in Christ or by Christ, that there can be no need of any addition from the Heathen philosophy, or from the Jewish law.”

both God and 'man.' Or (to use the words of Doddr.), as the passage contains an evident allusion to the *Shechinah* in which God dwelt, so it ultimately refers to the adorable *mystery* of the union of the *divine* and *human* natures, in the person of the glorious Emmanuel, which makes him such an object of our hope and confidence, as the most exalted *creature* with the most glorious endowments could never *of himself be*." Yet, strange to say, most interpreters for the last century have taken up expositions which approximate more or less to the Arian heresy, or even that of Socinus himself, regarding the words as merely signifying that God hath *lodged* in the hands of Christ a *fullness of gifts* to be conferred upon men; or, as only referring to his complete *knowledge of the divine will*. But there is so little ground for either opinion, that I may be held excused from detailing them, or the chief arguments brought against them. The former may be found in Heinr. and Rosenm., and the latter in Whitby and Mackn., or in the abstracts of Mr. Slade.

10. καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, "And (so) ye are complete in him, in all knowledge necessary to salvation." The interpretation, however, of πεπλ. will depend upon that adopted in the foregoing verse.

10. ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. This is to be understood as said *emphatically*, and with reference to some others in whom the heretics thought part of the power was vested. So Simon Magus and Corinthus, a statement of whose notions on this subject may be seen in Whitby.

11. ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ. The ἐν is for **ἃ**, *by*. We have here a popular mode of expression for, "by him ye have obtained a circumcision not made with hands and corporeal, but spiritual, and consisting in the putting off the sins of the body and the flesh, even by the circumcision (enjoined) of Christ." As the circumcision χειροποιήτος is opposed to that *in the flesh* (see Eph. 2, 11.), urged by the false teachers, so is the circumcision ἀχειροποιήτος that of *the heart*, and divinely effected, (which is spoken of in Rom. 2, 29), and of which even the Prophets of the Old Testament make mention. See Deut. 30, 6. Jer. 9, 26.

11. ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τ. σ. τ. ἀ. τ. σ. Heinr. observes, that as ἐνδύσαι signified close connection with, so did ἀπεκδύσαι denote the complete laying aside of any

thing, as of a garment (See Eph. 4, 22.) ; a metaphor derived, as Schoettg. thinks, from the Hebr. שָׁחַ. By σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς is meant, “the body, which indulges in the corrupt desires so natural to it.” The words τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, if genuine, (though they are omitted in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, are by Matthæi admitted to savour of a gloss, and are cancelled by Greisb.), have the force of an adjective. It is plain that to *put off this body of sin* signifies, “no longer to *employ* it for sinful purposes;” which *putting off* is compared to circumcision, since thereby sin is mortified, and *cut out*, and the principle of sin being kept under, we attain unto purity and holiness of life.

12. συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι. The Apostle illustrates the reformation and purity required of Christians by a fresh image; though employed on other occasions, as in Rom. 6, 3. seqq. where see the notes. On the sense of συνεγείρ. see the note on Eph. 2, 5 & 6.

13. καὶ ὑμᾶς, νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι. The same moral reformation is now represented by another and more forcible figure, similar to the former, but not to be confounded with it. (Heinr.) Here are enumerated other benefits received by Christians from Christ. There is the same sentiment, and in almost the same words, at Eph. 2, 1—5., where see the note. Before ἀκροβυστία must be repeated ἐν. The sense is: “because of that prepuce which is evil concupiscence.” Now this they had cast away on becoming Christians. (ver. 11.) Ἡ ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς, may also signify “the state of a Heathen;” for he who has the prepuce, is a Heathen; q. d. “miserable were you because of the heathenism in which you lived.” (Rosenm.) The former interpretation seems preferable. See Slade.

Ἡμῶν, which is found in the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is received by the recent Editors, is undoubtedly the true reading, not from the strength

of MS. authority, (which, in such minutiae, is little or none), but because the words following require it.

It has been observed, by Whitby, that baptism being a rite of initiation to Christians, as circumcision was to the Jews, it may be inferred that "baptism is Christ's ordinance for infants of believing parents, as circumcision was of old to the infants of the Jews." See much more in that Commentator.

14. ἐξαλείψας—τῷ σταυρῷ.

The *general scope* of the Apostle in these words is sufficiently plain; but to determine the *exact construction* is not so easy. This passage may, I think, be reckoned among the δυσνόητα of the Apostle, mentioned by St. Peter, on which more light is to be desired, though little to be expected. Upon the whole, we must be content with discerning the *general sense*, and not stumble at some confusion of metaphor. Some assistance towards its illustration, Rosenm. says, has been rendered by Noesselt in two Prolusions on this subject in his Exerc. Script. p. 212—253. Yet I cannot find any thing of much importance and truth, that had not been already discerned by former Commentators.

Ἐξαλείψας. This simply signifies *having annulled*: but there is (I think) an allusion, not, as most Commentators think, to the "crossing out an account in a tradesman's book," or the "blotting out or defacing a writing or bond (see Athen. ap. Wets.)," but to "the abrogating of any law by painting over the tablet on which it was written." So Lysias, cited by Rosenm.: τοὺς μὲν (νόμους) ἐνέγραφε, τοὺς δὲ ἐξαλείφεν. I would observe that ἐξαλείφω in the physical sense, *paint over*, occurs in Thucyd. 3, 22. Levit. 14, 42 & 48. 1 Par. 29, 9. See also Pollux 7, 124., and Eustathius.

14. τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον. The χειρόγραφον properly denoted a *bond, obligation, syngrapha*: but from a comparison of the parallel passage of Eph. 2, 15. it appears to mean a writing *generally*. Yet there is an allusion to its primitive sense; since, as Theophyl. observes, the law was an ἰδιόγραφον made with Moses, to which the Israelites bound themselves in the following words, Ex. 19, 8. πάντα ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς εἶπε ποιησόμεθα.

At δόγμασι some would understand σὺν; but others (more properly I think) ἐν; as in the parallel passage of Ephesians. Τοῖς δόγμασι is put, populariter, for ὃ ἦν δόγμα. The καθ' ἡμῶν is passed over by some Translators; by others rendered *with respect to*, or

concerning. Our Common Version has “*against us*,” which may be admitted, so that the sense be that by which we familiarly say, “I have an account *against you*.” By the *δόγμα*. are undoubtedly meant the ordinances, statutes, and external rites of the ceremonial law. Thus the Law of Moses is termed *γράμμω* at 2 Cor. 3, 6.

The words *ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν* are explained by Noesselt, Rosenm., and Schleus. (and, indeed, formerly by Vorst., Grot., and Pierce), as signifying, which law was the *cause* of disagreement between Jews and Gentiles.* But I see not how *ἡμῖν* can mean *us Gentiles*; and the above interpretation of *ὑπεναντίον* seems to be somewhat violent and precarious. Neither, however, am I satisfied with the common interpretation, “burdensome to us,” which sense cannot well be elicited from the term.

The phrase *ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου* is sufficiently plain, and appears to be a Latinism.

14. *προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ*. The force and scope of the metaphor here is difficult to be determined. The best Commentators are agreed that there is an allusion to the antient custom by which decrees, or writings in general, were cancelled, by having a nail drove through them. They therefore render: “nailing it to his cross, and by this, mangling the *χειρόγραφον*, annulling it.” And this is very agreeable to the general use of *προσηλόω*. For, besides Lucian and Demosth. (cited by Wets.), it is used of nailing a person to the cross in Joseph. 1247, 30. *προσήλουν δὲ—τοὺς ἄλοντας*. Some, indeed,

* See Noesselt ap. Rosenm. Whitby, too, explains it not very differently, as being a *middle wall of partition*, hindering them from coming to God, and putting an enmity between them and God's people, ver. 14 & 15., which Christ hath taken away by abolishing and dissolving the obligation of it, and admitting the Gentiles as fellow-heirs of the same promises and blessings with the Jews without it; or it is *contrary to us*, as being the ministration of death and condemnation, 2 Cor. 3, 7 & 9.

as Theophyl., take τῷ σταυρῷ for ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ, “by his cross,” which yields a far preferable *sense*, but I see not how this can be permitted by the *words*, for the Dative τῷ σταυρῷ must be governed of πρὸς.

15. ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν. Here it is, 4thly, ascribed to Christ’s merits, that by the total vanquishment of the enemies of Christianity he hath made our Christian course easy, and our passage safe. (Heinrichs.)

The terms are all military, and derived from a triumph over a conquered enemy, namely, by stripping them of arms, vestments, &c. Heinrichs cites Plut. Lucull. 514. ἐκδύσαι τοὺς βασιλεῖς. Rosenm. thinks that the middle has here no force, *improprie*. But it is so used in Plut. 2, 173. (cited by Wets.) ἔταξεν μαστιγοῦσθαι ἀποδυσασμένων τὰ ἱμάτια. Some (with far less probability) take it for an agonistical metaphor.

But *who* are meant by the ἀρχ. and ἐξουσ.? Most recent Commentators (after Kypke) think, the defenders of the χειρόγραφον just before mentioned, (i. e. the Mosaic Law), which was the greatest hindrance to the propagation of the Christian religion; namely, the *Jewish rulers and magistrates*. (See Whitby and Rosenm.) But this seems too hypothetical and formal. I see no reason to desert the opinion of the antients and most moderns, that the powers here mentioned are those of the Prince of this world and his subordinate agents, the evil demons (so Theophyl. τὰς διαβόλικας δυνάμεις λέγει), including Death himself, as personified. See 1 Cor. 15, 25 & 55. Heb. 2, 14. Joh. 16, 33, &c. And so Heinrichs. Yet the Jewish rulers may be *included*.

Heinrichs would here understand the destruction of idolatry, and the plucking up of deep-rooted superstitions. But *all that* had not been *yet* effected; though those particulars may be *included*, since idolatry and superstition were chiefly upheld by the ἀρχαὶ in question.

Δειγματίζειν signifies “to make one a public ex-

ample, or gazing stock," to ignominiously expose to triumph; as was done by conquered enemies. So Theophyl.: ἀσχημονῆσαι ἐποίησεν. Ἐν παρρησίᾳ signifies *openly, publicly*. (So Theophyl. δημοσίᾳ, πάντων ὁρώντων); as Joh. 7, 4. & 11, 54. (where see the note); or *confidently*, as Heinrichs explains. Θριαμβεύω, with an accusative of person, signifies to *triumph over*. At ἐν αὐτῷ some subaud χριστῷ; others, σταυρῷ, which is greatly preferable. So Theophyl.: ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοὺς δαιμόνας ἡττημένους δείξας. And again: Ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ οὖν τὸ τρόπαιον στήσας ὁ Κύριος. ὥσπερ ἐν δημοσίῳ θεατρῷ Ἑλλήνων, Ῥωμαίων, Ἰουδαίων, τοὺς δαίμονας ἐθριάμβευσεν.

16. μὴ οὖν—σαββάτων. Theophyl. observes, that hitherto the Apostle has spoken enigmatically on this head; but now he is more explicit, after having enumerated the above benefits. On the foregoing enumeration of the merits of Christ in reforming and saving the world, he engrafts a *conclusion*, ver. 16—fin., namely, that the praise of Christian virtue is no longer to be sought by the observances of the Mosaic Law, but in true moral reformation.

16. μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς—σαββάτων, "Wherefore (such being the case with the ceremonial law), let no one judge you (i. e. as you observe, or not) or condemn you in (respect of any rite connected with) meats," &c. The μέρει, Heinrichs observes, either signifies in any part of (so Theophyl.), or it is pleonastic, (and so it is considered by Rosenm. and Schleus.); as ἐν παιδίᾳ μέρει in Diog. Laert., and many other examples cited by Wets. But it should rather seem that ἐν μέρει is well rendered in the E. V. *in respect of*. And so Beza, Luther, and Wolf. Thus it is much the same with ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ 2 Cor. 3, 9. 3., *in the business of*. And see 1 Pet. 4, 16. The same explanation will hold good of almost all the examples adduced by the Philologists. The Apostle might have written ἐν μέρει βρώσεως ἢ πόσεως, &c., but he has chosen to vary the phraseology.

The other terms can require no explanation. See,

however, Mackn. on the σαββάτ., who rightly indicates the obligation to the observance of the Christian Sabbath.*

17. ἃ ἐστὶ σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τ. Χ., “which things (as compared to the future benefits to be obtained by Christ) are a mere shadow, but the substance is solely Christ, and the advantages to be obtained by him.” So it is remarked by Spencer ap. Whitby, that we are not to infer from hence that these and all the ritual constitutions of the Law of Moses, shadowed forth some Christian mystery, but only that they were as mere shadows compared to that solid and substantial truth which Christ, by his Gospel, hath discovered to us.” And such is the interpretation adopted by almost all judicious Commentators, antient and modern. So Theophyl.: Τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ σκιά εἰσι, τὸ δὲ σῶμα, τουτέστιν, ἡ ἀληθεία, Χριστοῦ. Ὡστε τί δεῖ σκιάν κρατεῖν, τοῦ σώματος παρόντος.

* On which subject I would respectfully refer my younger readers to an instructive treatise recently published by the learned and orthodox Mr. Holden, entitled, “The Christian Sabbath;” a work rendered almost necessary by the many frivolous pamphlets and *commentationes* on this subject, especially a most pernicious one of Gilbert Wakefield. To such as these the words of Wolf are very applicable: “Optandum erat, ut nostratum nonnulli ad illorum exemplum (adverting to certain writers who have written in vindication of the Sabbath) Sabbati Christiani moralitatem nunquam in dubium vocassent, otiumque suum rebus et commentationibus proficuis potius et πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν aptis, quam talibus impendissent, quæ ut rerum argumentis destituuntur, ita bonos offendunt, malos autem cultus divini negligetiores reddunt.” Mr. Bulkley has here much important matter from St. Barnabas, St. Ignatius, Justin Martyr (in his Dialogue with Trypho), Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome, which I would recommend to the attention of Mr. Holden for a future Edition of his work. Of these my limits will only permit me to insert the following from St. Barnabas: “The eighth day is the beginning of another world; therefore we celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which Jesus rose from the dead, and appeared and ascended into the heavens;” and Ignat. Epist. p. 34, 35. (speaking of the antient Prophets): Εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἡλυθον, μήκετι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες.

Of this sense of *σκιὰ* and *σῶμα* it were needless to adduce any of the numerous Classical examples collected by the Philologists. On the words *τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ* there is some uncertainty. But the best Commentators are agreed that the genitive is put for the dative with *ἐν* ; q. d. “ the *thing* (i. e. the *truth* itself), the future blessings themselves are situated and reside in Christ, from whom alone they are to be sought.”

18. *μηδὲς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύτω*. The term *καταβραβ.* (which is reckoned by Jerome among the Apostle's *Cilicisms* (though examples are found in Demosth., Polyb., and Plutarch), has been variously interpreted. It signifies, properly, “ to deprive any one of the *βραβεῖον*, or *prize*, which he deserves, by some art or trick (for *κατὰ* has thus the sense of *παρά*). Hence it comes to signify, “ exercise unjust and fraudulent judgment upon.” Whence it has here been explained to *deceive, circumvent*, like *παράλογίζεσθαι* at supra 4. By others, as Bengel, it is interpreted, “ exercise despotic and abused authority over.” For other interpretations I must refer the reader to Pole, Wolf, and Heinrichs. Wolf and Hammond explain *condemn* ; Whitby, *damnify*. The interpretation first mentioned (which is supported by our Common Version) seems to be the most natural. The sense is clear from ver. 16. *μή τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω* ; q. d. “ Let no man deceive or damnify you, drawing you off from the true doctrine to a factitious one at variance with the Gospel.”

The use of *θέλων* is very anomalous ; and several Commentators render it, “ by a voluntary humility.” And so Beza, Dav., Dath, and J. Capell. See also Wesseling on Herod. 9, 14. But this may be wandering too far. Theophyl. renders : *θέλουσιν ἡμᾶς καταβραβεύειν διὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης δοκούσης*. Others explain, “ delighting in,” i. e. by delighting, or who delights in. So Casaub., Hamm., Vatablus, and Knatchbull. It is not easy to say which deserves

the preference. Wolf, who carefully examines both, assigns it to the former, and perhaps rightly. Almost all recent Commentators adopt the latter.

On the sense of ταπεινοφροσύνη Commentators are little agreed. Those who take θέλων in the signification *dwelling in*, render it, “*tenuitas in victu*, an ascetic and Pharasaical kind of life.” But this sense seems too arbitrary, and is little authorized. I see no reason to desert that of *modestia*, which is accordant with the usage of the Scriptural writers; and, united with θέλων, the term denotes (as Doddr. says) “an affected and fantastic, if not counterfeit, humility and lowliness of mind.”

18. καὶ θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων. Of these words there are two interpretations; 1st, that of the antients and most moderns, “the worshipping of angels (this being the *genitive of object*, on which see Krebs in loc.) and interpreters of men’s prayers, and their intercessors with God.” See Tob. 12, 15. 2dly, that of some eminent moderns, and especially the recent Commentators, “worship such as angels render to God.” And so the genitive is used in Sapien. 14, 27. But this interpretation is liable to many objections, which are well stated by Heinrichs, who satisfactorily defends the former, which is supported by the unanimous authority of the antients. The words are levelled against persons who (whether they derived their opinions from the Essenes, or from some Heathen philosophers) maintained the existence of angels or δαίμονες, as *intercessors* and *mediators* of prayer (not of *salvation*), under an idea that immediate access to the Deity, was unattainable and presumptuous. It is needless for me to enter into this subject, since it has been so fully treated by Dr. Whitby. Grot. well observes (after Theophyl.) that there was an affectation of humility in this, as if they dared not venture *themselves* to prefer their petitions. It is well remarked by an anonymous writer ap. Wets.: “Modestiam simulantes tumidi sunt.”

18. ἀ μὴ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, “intruding and prying

into that which he hath not, and doth not understand." Such appears to be the sense of ἐμβ., though Philologists are not quite agreed, Jerome and Erasm. rendering it, "*incidens fastuosè*," by a metaphor taken from the tragic ἐμβάδες. But this interpretation (as Beza and Schleus. observe), is neither agreeable to *doctrine*, nor founded on any *authority*. The sense "*prying*" is supported and illustrated by many eminent Critics, as Bos, Raphel, Schleus., and Heinr., who adduce examples from the Classical writers and Lexicographers. As to that of our Common Version, *intruding into*, it is also well supported by Classical authority (see Schleus. Lex.): but the sense *prying* is more apposite; though, indeed, both may be united. I would render: "stepping out of his bounds, and prying into what it is impossible for him to fathom." Ἐώρακεν, *known, understood*. A signification common in verbs of *seeing*, both Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. Rosenm. compares 1 Tim. 1, 7.*

18. εἰκῇ φυσιοῦμένος, "vainly puffed up and proud." This metaphor of inflation to designate pride is perpetual. See the Philological Commentators. Εἰκῇ, *causelessly, irrationally*, as accompanied with ignorance. So Matt. 9, 22. and 1 Tim. 6, 4. τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος. This is the simplest method of interpretation. Others are pursued by the Commentators. See Pole, Wolf, and Heinrichs. It is observed by Rosenm., that the words of Christ, Luke 11, 5., contain so exact a description of such kind of Jewish teachers, that it will serve as a commentary to this passage.

* And he remarks: "Nempe, qui addicti erant Judaicis institutis, ignorabant, concessa esse in legibus Mosaicis multa, quæ nec vim tamen præceptorum haberent, omnia autem non nisi ad tempus, nullis, nisi Israelitis injuncta, plurima præter hæc hominum arbitrio, non Dei mandato, sancita, prætereaque Christianis, a legis Mosaicæ vinculo per Christum liberatis, antiquata præcepta, et vero etiam iis, qui stirpe de Israëlitiâ non essent, hæc eadem, quæ Judæis, religione servandâ obtrudebant. Cf. 2 Cor. 3, 13."

19. καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, “and not keeping hold of, holding fast by the head (even Christ).” Κρατεῖν signifies to hold fast by, keep close to, follow. For examples Heinrichs and Schleus. refer to Luke 4, 42. Acts 3, 11. and Apoc. 2, 13. Κεφαλὴν, “only master and moderator.” Ἐξ οὗ, for ἐξ ἧς, by the πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον. On the sense of the rest of the passage, which is almost verbatim the same as Eph. 4, 16.. see the note there, as also the notes of Whitby and Mackn. in loc.

20. εἰ οὖν ἀπεθάνετε σὺν τῷ Χ. ἀ. τ. σ. τ. κ. “But if ye be dead with Christ to, and have renounced those elements of the world.” Heinr. paraphrases: “Quàm parum quæso vobis constatis, quàm vobis contradicitis, si nuntio elementar ireligioni ceremoniarumque nugis misso, in eis tamen observandis æquè religiosos vos præstatis.” The τὰ στοιχεῖα Noesselt and Heinrichs explain of *signs, ceremonies*, affecting the senses only, an external and adumbrated worship of God, such as is described supra ver. 16 and Gal. 4, 10. Somewhat preferable is the exposition of στ, by Koppe on Gal. 3, 4. and Schleus. in v. : *religio, rudior illa et imperfecta, sensibus omnia subiciens pœnisque terrens, qua ad perfectiorem christianam præparandi erant Judæi æquè ac Gentiles*. See the notes on the above passages of Galat. The Critics just mentioned do not, however, successfully assign a *reason* for this use of κόσμου, as applied to the Jewish superstition. They think it was so used in order to retaliate on the Jews their own contemptuous appellation bestowed on the Heathens. But it perhaps rather denotes what we call the *mob*, the *profanum vulgus*. So that by στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are meant such rude, imperfect, gross, and sensual notions of religion, as are suitable to the profanum vulgus, the bulk of mankind.

20. ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ, viz. at baptism; as is plain from supra ver. 13. and Rom. 6, 4., where see the notes. Τῷ—δογματίζεσθε, “why do ye hold opinions as if living in the profession, not of the spi-

ritual and enlightened doctrines of Christ, but in the gross and grovelling ones of the vulgus, namely, in Judaism." Δογματίζεσθαι is a word often used by the Philosophers; as Diog. Laert., Arrian, and Sext. Emp. (See Schleus. and Wets.) Many Commentators explain it here, "to suffer doctrines to be imposed upon you." So Grot. and Schleus. Others, "to hold dogmas or doctrines." The former interpretation seems preferable, on account of the ἐντάλματα just after. And so Theophyl.: ὡς παῖδιά ἀρτιμαθῇ κάθησθῆ, φησι, δογματιζόμενοι καὶ νομοθετούμενοι τί δεῖ ποιεῖν. The latter, however, may be included.

21. μὴ ἅψη, μηδὲ γεύσῃ, μηδὲ θίγῃς. Here we have a parenthesis containing a specimen of the *kind* of δόγματα just adverted to. The words are strangely rendered by Mackn., "Neither taste, touch, nor handle." Our common translation, if thus pointed, will fully represent the sense: "Touch not—taste not—handle not;" q. d. "Touch not this—taste not that," &c. These are (as Heinr. observes) specimens of ἐντάλματα expressed *imperatoria brevitate*. On the distinct sense of the ἅψη, γεύσῃ, and θίγῃς Commentators are by no means agreed. Some, as Crell. and Heinr., regard them as synonymes accumulated (by a sort of climax) to show the severity of the interdict,* and all having reference to *forbidden meats*. But this seems too formal; and θίγῃς will scarcely bear the sense they assign, at least there is no *Scriptural* authority for it. The same may be said of ἅψη, which though it is often used in the Classical writers, yet I think never in the New Testament. As to Slade's criticism, that "it never has this except with the addition of a genitive," I must confess that in the passages cited by the Commentators (and also a great number which I had myself collected in the course of my reading) I do not find *one* in which the genitive is omitted; yet I see not

* So Mackn. observes there is here a beautiful gradation; eating being more than tasting, and tasting more than handling."

why it *might not*; as in Soph. Aj. 841. γεύεσθε μὴ φείδεσθε πανδήμου στρατοῦ. In the present passage, however, it *could* not have been expressed.

Others, as Grot. and Storr, take the ἅψῃ to mean, “touch not a woman.” But though the Apostle uses the word in that sense at 1 Cor. 7, 1., yet it is with γυναικὸς, the *omission* of which would here be very harsh. Neither is it likely that the Apostle would here introduce *such* a subject, which indeed would little correspond to the words following, ἃ ἐστὶ—ἀποχρήσει. The μὴ ἅψῃς and μὴ θίγῃς seem to be interdicts of the same species: but I am not prepared to adopt Mr. Slade’s opinion, that “the former signifies *handle not*; the latter, *come not into contact with*.” For as to ἅπτεσθαι, usually signifying *touch with the hand*,” that will equally hold good of θίγ.: which does not reach far enough. It should rather seem that ἅπτ. signifies to *touch with the hand, lay hands upon* (as in Thucyd. 2, 49. τὸ μὲν ἔξωθεν ἅπτομένῳ σῶμα οὐκ ἄγαν θερμὸν ἦν); whereas θίγειν signifies something more, namely, *contracto*; whence it is often used in sensu nequiori. Yet, for the reasons above assigned, I would not seek such a signification *here*, but refer it, together with ἅψῃ, to the having contact, greater or less, with objects by which ceremonial pollution might be incurred. It is evident that the Apostle intends no great exactness.

22. ἃ ἐστὶ πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει. It is of importance here to bear in mind what was just said, namely, that the Apostle in the terms μὴ ἅψῃ intended no great exactness. And therefore those Commentators who here tell us that the ἃ ἐστὶ, &c. has reference to *all* the above particulars, seem to increase the difficulty very needlessly. On the sense of the words Commentators are divided in opinion. Much depends upon the sense in which ἀποχρήσει is taken, which some, as Hamm., Doddr., Wells, and Schmidt render *abuse*. Yet the sense they lay down is quite at variance with the context, and, as Heinr.

observes, very jejune. Almost all Commentators, antient and modern, take ἀποχρ. (and, I think, rightly,) in the sense, *use*, or *using*. And so our common Version, and also Wolf, whose words are these: “De usu ciborum ipso loqui Apostolum non dubito. Neque enim in eo erat, ut ab *abusu* tantum cavere juberet suos, qui ritus ejusmodi omnes penitus intercedisse ante tradiderat.” Of this sense the Commentators adduce examples, to which I could add scores which I have noted down. Yet all those who adopt *this* sense, are not *agreed* in interpretation. Schleus. renders: “Quarum rerum usus perniciem et maximas pœnas affert.” And so Heinr., who thinks these are the words of a Jewish Doctor ironically repeated by the Apostle. But such a sense cannot fairly be elicited from the words; and as to Heinrich’s notion, it is too fanciful. Upon the whole, I see no interpretation so natural and probable as that of the antients, and, of the moderns, Grot., Wolf, Rosenm., and others, namely, “which things are all so far from polluting the user, that they rather themselves perish by using, and tend only to corruption,” i. e. animal destruction; conformably to the words of our Lord, Matt. 15, 17 & 18. So Theophyl., who paraphrases: φησὶν, ὅτι οὐ μεγάλα τινὰ ταῦτα ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ εἰς φθορὰν καταλήγει τοῖς χρωμένοις· φθειρόμενα γὰρ ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ, διὰ τοῦ ἀφεδρώ- νος ὑπορῶει· οὔτε οὖν ὠφελοῦσιν αὐτὰ καθ’ αὐτὰ, οὔτε βλάπτουσι.

The words κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα—ἀνθρώπων are to be joined with δογματίζεσθε. The sense of the two verses 20—22. is thus expressed by Rosenm.: “*Quid suscipitis aut fertis, si quid vobis ingerit, ista decreta (qualia sunt: noli tangere; neve gustare, neve contrectare hujus rei aliquid, quod est vetitum lege Mosaicâ veterumque præceptis, cibos inprimis interdictos, quod omne perit tamen s. conficitur ipso usu;)* quæ certè decreta proficiscuntur a præceptis doctrinisque humanis.”

23. ἅτινα ἐστὶ—τῆς σαρκὸς, “which ἐντάλματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων,” &c. By these are meant chiefly those of the Essenes. Λόγον many Commentators interpret a *pretext* or *pretence*. See Doddr. and Kypke. But I prefer the sense assigned by the antients and most moderns, *speciem*, a *show*, not a reality. So Chrys. and Theophyl. : λόγον—οὐ δύναμιν, οὐδὲ ἀλήθειαν. This is hinted at in the μὲν without δέ.* Rosenm. (after Noesselt) observes, that σοφία is here the same as φιλοσοφία at ver. 18., or ψευδανόμος γνῶσις at 1 Tim. 6, 20.

23. ἐν ἐβελοθησκείᾳ. There is here an ellipsis, to be thus supplied : “*as shown, evinced only* in ἐβελοθρ. The word is rendered by all our English Translators, *will worship* (i. e. *voluntary* worship), which may be defended. (See Grot., and consult the long and instructive, but somewhat rambling, annotation of Hamm.) Yet I prefer the sense assigned to the word, after much critical examination, by the Philologists of the last century (as embodied in Heinr. and Schleus.), namely, “an excessive, pretended, and affected sanctity.” And this is also supported by some antient Interpreters. Thus Theophyl. explains it τὴν ὑποκρινομένην εὐλάβειαν ἐν τῇ θρησκείᾳ. See also Chrysost. and Œcumen. And in this sense the word is sometimes used by the early Ecclesiastical writers. So ἐβελοπερισσοθησκεία is cited by Heinr. from Epiphan. de Hæres., where it is used of the Pharisees. Heinr. has ingeniously shown how ἐβελο. comes to mean *affected*.

23. καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη. On the sense of this word see the note *supra* ver. 18. From the context it appears to signify that kind of *affected humility*

* On which it is remarked by Jerome ap. Wets. : “Hoc loco quidem conjunctio superflua est, quod in plerisque locis propter imperitiam artis grammaticæ Apostolum fecisse reperimus. Neque enim sequitur sed vel alia conjunctio, quæ solet ei propositioni, ubi quidem positum fuerat, respondere.” The criticism is, however, like many other *theological* remarks of that Father, ill founded.

under which ever lurks pride,* and which is of all kinds of arrogance the worst. Ἀφειδεία σωματος. This is explained by the recent Commentators *harsh treatment of*; as if it were said by meiosis, as ἀφειδεῖν in Thucyd. 2, 43 and 51. It is explained by Œcumen. καταφρόνησιν τοῦ σώματος. And so Theophyl. It evidently denotes a neglect of the comforts, whether of food or clothing, rest, &c. which the body requires. I cannot think, with some, that this includes *flagellation*.

23. οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς. Mackn. here rashly supplies δέ, and unwarrantably takes occasion to suspend a clause from it, which disfigures the sense of all the rest. The Apostle (I conceive) *as* he has shown in what Christian wisdom did *not* consist (namely, in unnecessary and affected austerities), so now he shows in what it *does* consist, or is consistent with, namely, τιμῇ πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς. By τιμῇ is meant a *cherishing* of the body, (for σώματος must be repeated), a sense found in 1 Cor. 12, 23. 1 Tim. 5, 17. and elsewhere. The words πρὸς πλησμονὴν show the *kind* of care here meant, namely, the satisfying of its wants, so as to keep up its strength for the duties of life (see Elsner), and that the body may thus serve the soul, which an excess either way would prevent. See Chrys. and Theophyl., and also Mackn., who concludes by observing, that “the wisdom which teaches the *neglecting* of the body, is not *wisdom*, but *folly*.” This is so plainly the Apostle’s meaning, that it is strange any should have missed it; and yet many Commentators have so done; for, not to notice the subtilties of Grot. and Heinr., and the harsh constructions of Camer. and Casaub., even the sensible Doddr. renders: “to the dishonourable satisfying of the flesh;” a version entirely founded in error.

* To which purpose may be aptly cited M. Anton. 12, 27. ὑπὸ ἀτυφία (read ἀτυφίας) τύφος τυφόμενος πάντων χαλεπώτατος. Here, too, the words of our Christian Poet will be applicable:

“Pride may be pampered while the flesh grows lean;
Humility may clothe an English dean.”

CHAP. III.

Having thus far treated on what a true Christian ought *not* to follow after, (see note on 2, 16.) the Apostle now subjoins what he *ought*, and on what to fix his affections. That admirable part of the Epistle which now follows abounds in the most excellent moral precepts, and impresses the mind with a deep sense of the dignity and worth of a true Christian. These extend to ver. 17. (Heinr.)

VERSE 1 & 2. εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τ. Χ. τ. ἁ. ζ. The sense seems to be: "If then ye have really died with Christ unto the observance of Jewish rites (see 2, 20), and have risen with him to better hopes, and by his example profess to pursue better aims, no longer then grovel in the mire of worldly and fleshly superstition, but seek and follow after those purposes which are *heavenly*, and aim at those blessings which are seated where your Redeemer will dispense them, who sitteth at the right hand of God for ever, and is invested with authority to bless and reward all his faithful servants." Such seems to be the best grounded sense that can be assigned, and it is supported by the authority both of the antients and the most judicious moderns. But the full meaning of the Apostle requires to be developed at far greater length. To which purpose the many excellent Sermons of our best English Divines may advantageously be consulted, one of which (Bp. Sherlock, 3, 11.) is pointed out by Mr. Slade.

The sentiment in τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε is further developed in τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε—γῆς. The φρονεῖτε is well rendered in our English Version, "set your affections on;" from which Doddr. had causelessly deviated. On the τὰ ἄνω many Commentators have indulged in ingenious, but little solid speculations. Wets. understands it thus; "Supera studere debebant, sed non astra et motus lunæ, ut Judæi et Pythagorei." Calvin, with far more probability, takes

it of the sublimer doctrines of Christianity, as opposed to the *στοιχεῖα* mentioned at 2, 20. Yet it is objected by Doddr., that those are not *in heaven*. This, however, seems not very conclusive. It is plain that the words must be taken in their popular acceptation, and in all that *extent* of signification which a plain Christian would assign to them. And it is well observed by Doddr., that the Apostle proceeds, on the principles he had laid down, to graft a most important practical exhortation, different from any he had advanced before (as he certainly does at ver. 5.); yet nothing could more effectually tend to take them off from those bigoted attachments of which he was solicitous to cure them.*

3, 4. These verses, Heinr. observes, are to be conjoined, and mutually explained from each other.

Ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ, “you have, by baptism, professed to bid adieu to your former life, τοῖς κάτω, τῷ κόσμῳ,” &c. See the note on 2, 11 and 12. The words ἡ ζωὴ —Θεῷ admit of more than one sense. Some recent Commentators, as Heinr., take ἡ ζωὴ to mean “your former life now laid aside by spiritual death, the superstition and immorality connected with it, and the worldly advantages to be expected from it.” But this is harsh, and unsuitable to the context. The true interpretation seems to be that of Theophyl. (from Chrys.): πάλιν, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν ἄνω· ὥστε καὶ τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε· Φιλονεικεῖ γὰρ δεῖξαι αὐτοὺς καθημένους, ἄνω, καὶ ἄλλην ζῶντας ζωὴν, τὴν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν μὴ φαινομένην· Μὴ φαίνεται ὁ Χριστὸς· οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν φαίνεται· Τί οὖν ζητεῖτε τὰ φαινόμενα; Ταῦτα δὲ προκατασκευάζει, ἵνα εὐθὺς ἐμπέσῃ εἰς τὸν ἡθικὸν λόγον. And Theo-

* Of the Classical citations in Wets. the most apposite are the following. Heliodor. 7, 23. ὁρῶ γὰρ πῶς κάκεινῃν ἄνω καὶ μέγα φρονοῦσαν. Plato de Rep. 7. οὔτε μαθεῖν ἂν πῶ φῆμι αὐτὸν, ἐπιστήμην γὰρ οὐδὲ ἔχειν τῶν τοιούτων, οὔτε ἄνω ἀλλὰ κάτω αὐτοῦ βλέπειν τὴν ψυχὴν. Seneca Ep. 79. Sursum vocant illum initia sua: erit autem illic, etiam antequam hæc custodia exsolvatur, cùm vitia disjecerit, purusque ac levis in divinas cogitationes emicuerit. Persius 2, 61. O curvæ in terras animæ, et cœlestium inanes. Lucian Hermot. 5. ὑψηλὰ ἤδη φρονεῖς καὶ ἄνωθι.

doret: ἐκείνου γὰρ ἀναστάντος πάντες ἠγέρθημεν· ἀλλ' οὐδέπω ὁρῶμεν τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν ἔκβασιν· κέκρυπται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀναστάσεως τὸ μυστήριον· ὅταν τοίνυν ἐπιφανῇ τὸ δεύτερον, τὴνικαῦτα τευξόμεθα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ἀπολαυσόμεθα τῆς ἀθανάτου ζωῆς. And so it is explained by some eminent modern Commentators, as Rosenm.

Ἐν Θεῷ, “in the mind of God.” Σὺν Χριστῷ, “after the manner and example of Christ.” “The life of a Christian (observes Doddr.) is here represented as an invaluable *jewel*, and under a double *security*, reserved in heaven, and laid up with Christ in God; secure, therefore, as the abode of Christ with the Father, or as the fidelity and immutability of the Father himself could make it.” This, however, seems rather ingenious than solid.

4. ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς—δόξῃ, “But when Christ, who is our life (i. e. the author of it, Joh. 11, 25.), shall appear, i. e. at his second advent, as Judge, then shall ye appear with him in glory, i. e. happiness.” Theophyl. (from Chrys.) makes the following inference: Ὡστε ἐκείνην ζητεῖτε τὴν ἡμέραν, μὴ ταύτην· πρὸς ἐκείνην ζωὴν σπεύδετε· τότε γὰρ ἡ ἀληθινὴ ζωὴ ὑμῶν φανερούται· ἡ γὰρ νῦν, θάνατος, ὅτι καὶ διὰ φθορᾶς συνίσταται, τῆς ῥοῆς καὶ ἀπορροῆς. Μὴ τιμὰς ἐνταῦθα ζητεῖτε καὶ δόξας· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἡ δόξα ὑμῶν. He then subjoins a fine comparison derived from the *pearl oyster*.

5. νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, “mortify therefore, and render as dead (so far as sin is concerned), your earthly members.” Τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, “which are used for the purposes of this life.” Theophyl. explains: τὰ σωματικὰ μέλη. Νεκροῦν is a strong expression, the force of which is too much *diluted* by the exposition of some recent Interpreters, *debilitare*. It signifies, “deprive of all force, obtain complete mastery over.” From what follows, however, it should seem that Theophyl. has rightly remarked, that by the τὰ μέλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, are meant the τὰ διὰ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ σώματος ἐπιτελούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτήματα. And so Theodoret. Thus the

μέλη are put improprie for the lusts worked in those members. The apparent inconsistency between the νεκρώσατε and the expression elsewhere used by the Apostle, συνετάφητε τῷ Χριστῷ, Theophyl. thus removes: ὅτι ἡ μὲν προτέρα νέκρωσις τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἦν δῶρον, ἀποκτινύουσα τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν προγεγονυῖαν ἁμαρτίαν· ἡ δὲ νῦν ὑποτιθεμένη νέκρωσις· τῆς ἡμετέρας προαιρέσεως, τὰς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἁμαρτίας ἀφανίζουσα, μᾶλλον δε μὴδὲ ἀναζητᾶν ἐώσα ὅλως, διὰ τοῦ θανατοῦν τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς.

The terms πορνείαν and ἀκαθαρσίαν, require no explanation. The πάθος denotes venereal lust of the most flagitious sort; as we may infer from Rom. 1, 26., παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας, with which the Apostle prefaces a description of vices the most abominable. Hence the Latin *Pathicus*. Here, too, Classical examples are referred to by Schleus. On the terms in question, Theophyl. remarks: Παρῆκεν ἰδικῶς εἰπεῖν ἃ οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν καλόν· καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ τοῦ πάθους πάντα ἐνέφηγε τὰ τῶν αἰχρῶν μίξεων εἶδη.

5. ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν. This is illustrated from 1 Thess. 4, 5., μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας. Ἐπιθυμία is, like almost all words of this kind, properly a vox mediæ significationis. So Midrasch Cohel: concupiscentia bona subjugavit concupiscentiam malam. See also Theophyl., who cites Dan. 9, 23. On the τὴν πλεονεξίαν—εἰδωλολατρεία, see the note on Eph. 5, 5.

7. ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε πότε, ὅτε ἐξῆτε ἐν αὐτοῖς, “in which (vices) ye also once (more or less) walked, were *habituated* to, when ye lived among them,” i. e. the children of disobedience, the Heathens. Such is the explanation given by Rosenm., Dodd., and Mackn. The ἐξῆτε ἐν αὐτοῖς is, however, more usually, and perhaps more rightly, referred to the ἄ. Certainly this is supported by the Classical examples adduced by the Philologists. See Wolf and Wets. Thus Grot. explains: “when ye were moved by such affections and passions.” It is therefore *no* tautology, as Mackn. objected. Here

may be compared a very similar passage in 1 Cor. 6, 11.

8. νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, “But now that you are become Christians, put ye away them all.” The καὶ signifies *vicissim*. Under the τὰ πάντα much meaning is comprehended; i. e. all the vices above mentioned, and also anger, &c. Here, ὀργὴ and θυμὸς are joined, as at Rom. 2, 8., Eph. 4, 31., where see the notes. Κακίαν. See Eph. 4, 31., and the note there. Βλασφημία and αἰσχρολογία are placed together as being vices nearly allied; the former, consisting in injurious and calumnious speaking; the latter, in filthy, lewd, and immodest discourse. The works ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν, are added, to strengthen the sense. It, however, seems a blending of two phrases, “lay aside filthy conversation, and let it not come out of your mouth.” The latter, occurs in Ephes. 4, 29. where see the note.

9. μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους—αὐτοῦ. See the note on Ephes. 4, 22—24., to which I add the following citation. Pindar. Pyth. 4., 177., ἐχθίστοισι μὴ ψεύδεσι καταμιαίναις, i. e. καταμιαίνῃς τὴν γένναν.

9. ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸ παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον. I would compare Pyrrh. ap. Diog. Laert. 2, 66., ὡς χάλεπον εἶη ἐκδύναί ἄνθρωπον (where I would read), τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

10. καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον—κτίσαντος αὐτὸν, “and have put on the new man, who is renewed and reformed unto a knowledge like unto *His* knowledge who created him,” i. e. made him a Christian such as he is. Now, this κτίσις is effected not merely by baptism, and a moral life (as Theophyl. says), nor by the doctrine of Christ only (as Rosenm.), but by *both* these, nay, also by *other* methods, united with the influence of the Holy Spirit, to dilate on which would be here out of place.

Wets. cites Philo. 15, 45., ἡ δ' εἰκὼν λέλεκται κατὰ τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἡγεμόνα νοῦν.

11. ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἑλλήν—ἐλεύθερος. The ὅπου signifies, “in which new creation or regeneration.”

The οὐκ ἔστι has much sense ; q. d. “ there is no enquiry whether any one be Greek or Jew.” See a very similar passage in Gal. 3, 28., and the note. The distribution into Jews and Greeks, circumcision and uncircumcision, is frequent. On the terms Βαρβάρος, Σκύθης, Heinr. observes, that they are not opposites, like the former ; otherwise we should have had Βαρβ. καὶ Ρωμαῖος ; but there is a kind of climax ; q. d. barbarous nations, nay, that which is most so, Scythia. The copious Classical illustrations of the Commentators show that *Scythian* was a proverbial term for *barbarian*. It is not, however, very necessary to adduce any of them : but I shall lay before my readers a passage which I found in Max. Tyr. Diss. 17, 4., οὐδὲ τὸν Σκύθη οὐδὲ τὸν Ἑλληνα οὐδὲ τὸν Περσὴν, ἢ τὸν Ὑπερβόρειον. And, a little further on, ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ἕλλην λέγει, καὶ ὁ Βάρβαρος, ὁ ἡπειρώτης καὶ ὁ θαλάττιος καὶ ὁ σόφος καὶ ὁ ἄσοφος.

11. ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστός. These words have the same sense as those at 1 Cor. 15, 28., where see the note.

12. ἐνδύσασθε οὖν—οἰκτιρισμῶν, “ Having, then, these glorious hopes on an equal footing with the elect people of God, not only detest and avoid the vices just mentioned, but cultivate those virtues which especially become those to whom God hath shewn such mercy and loving kindness, namely, compassion,” &c. Such I conceive to be the true connection of the passage with the preceding.

The terms ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι (as at Hebr. 3, 1., and 1 Pet. 2, 9.), each suggest motives for the exercise of the virtues in question, and they are here *accumulated* with all the characteristic warm-heartedness of the Apostle. Indeed, virtues like these, were especially necessary in a society formed of such discordant materials as that of Colossæ. Hence the earnestness of the Apostle’s injunctions.

The metaphor in ἐνδύσασθε σπλάγχνα is not unfrequent. See Rom. 13, 12., and Eph. 6, 11., and the

notes there. The term imports, "habitual study of, and diligence in, any thing." See Kypke, who cites Themist. Or. 24., ἐπειδὴ περ ἀρετὴν ἀντὶ ἱματίων ἡμφέστο. Athenæus 565., βουλόμενοι ἐνδύεσθαι αὐτὴν αὐταρκεῖαν. And so Berachoth, fol. 16, 2. (cited by Wets.), Induas te misericordiâ tuâ, et cooperias te potentiâ tuâ, et circumvolvas te bonitate tuâ, et circumcingas te miseratione.

The terms ἐκλεκτοὶ, ἡγαπημένοι, ἅγιοι, and σπλάγχνα, have been before explained; as also the others.

13. See the note on Eph. 4, 2 & 32.

14. See the note on the parallel passage of Eph. 4, 3. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις, "above all these things." So in the passage of Eph. One may also compare Lucian 3, 142, 44. et. sq.

15. καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, "And (then) the peace of God," &c. Several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, have τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is approved by many Critics, and received by Griesbach; though on what grounds it is difficult to say: for *critical* reasons are here very uncertain; and *doctrinal* ones are of little use; since either reading yields a good sense. Yet Θεοῦ appears to be preferable, and is defended by a similar passage of Phil. 4, 7.; though the Critics pretend that this reading was introduced from thence; which is more than I can believe would take place in *nearly all* the MSS. See the note on that passage.

In the interpretation of βραβεύετω it is not necessary to dwell on the primary sense of the term; for though it properly signifies to exercise the office of judge and arbitrator, yet it came to mean simply *moderari*; as in Polyb. ap. Raphel: "Ἀπαν τὸ γινόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν θυμῷ μᾶλλον ἢ λογισμῷ βραβεύεται, and in some passages cited by Elsner. The sense then, is: "let it be the rule of your feelings and actions." Thus it differs little from the φρουρήσει in the parallel passage of Philippians. The words are thus explained by Theophyl.: Αὕτη οὖν βραβεύετω ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὁ θυμὸς, μὴ ἡ φιλονεικία, μὴ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη εἰρήνη.

ἐκείνη γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀμύνασθαι γίνεται, ἐκ τοῦ ἀντιδρᾶν ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ βεβαία, ἢ ἀδιάλυτος, ἢ διὰ μηδὲν κοσμικὸν ἀγαθὸν γινομένη, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς διὰ τι ἐγένετο.

15. εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε, “unto which (peace) also ye were called,” i. e. in becoming Christians, and being initiated into his religion, who preached peace on earth. Besides, as Theophyl. observes, “when Christ called us to peace, he made us one body; he being the head. Why, then, else are we one body but that, being members of each other, we should preserve this, and not be separated?”

15. ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι is said by the Commentators to be for εἰς ἓν σῶμα. But we must also subaud εἶναι. Now *this*, without the study of peace and concord, would be impracticable. See 1 Cor. 10, 17.

15. καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε. Some antients (as Hilary), and many moderns (as Erasm., Vatab., and Wolf, and indeed most *recent* Commentators) render the εὐχαρ. *amiable*, or *mild* and *gentle*. Of this signification they adduce Classical examples in abundance; and reasons why that interpretation might be received are not wanting. Others may be seen in Schl. Lex. But, after all, I dare not venture to abandon the common one, supported as it is by so consummate a judge of Greek phraseology as Chrysost., and since it is adopted by the other Greek Commentators, and not only by *most* modern Commentators, but *some* very eminent Critics, as Grot., Casaub., and recently Heinrichs. Nor does the term signify (as Wolf would have us think) gratitude to *men*, but gratitude and thankfulness to *God*, for having called us unto such blessings, as members of his Church. This sense is so natural, and so agreeable to what follows (as εὐχαριστοῦντες), that we may overlook the superiority, in point of Classical authority, which the other interpretation can boast.

16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικίτω ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. It is observed, by Theophyl. : δείκνυσιν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν δι' ἧς εὐχάριστοι ἐσόμεθα. The connection seems

to be : “ And let this gratitude be evinced (among other ways) by often exercising yourselves on the glories of redemption.” In determining the exact sense, much depends upon the force to be assigned to *ἐνοικ*. Many Commentators, as Rosenm., explain : “ Let the doctrine of Christ be frequently and copiously treated of in your society. For (he adds) the doctrine of Christ dwells in such a society, when it is so copiously treated of at all fit times and places that no one want an opportunity of learning.” This indeed is very agreeable to what follows; but is scarcely to be elicited from *ἐνοικ*. I therefore prefer the interpretation of some antient and many moderns, namely : “ Let the doctrine of Christ, and the truths of the Gospel, be deeply seated in your hearts, and never depart from it, but be exercised as occasion may serve.” Schoettg. compares Tanchuma, fol. 24, 3. *Lex sedem figat in medio ipsorum*. And Mechilta, fol. 19, 1. *Lex perfecta sit inter ipsos*.

16. *πλουσίως, penitus*. Ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ is, by some recent Commentators, construed with *διδάσκοντες*. But the more natural, as well as usual construction, is with the *former* words. See also Col. 1, 9. and Eph. 1, 8. On the terms here used it is not necessary to press, nor take *σοφία* for *ἀρέτη* as is done by Theophyl. We must take *ἐν* for *σὺν*, and bear in mind (with Grot. and Heinr.) that the Gospel is accompanied with *true wisdom* (1 Cor. 1, 30. & 2, 6. Eph. 1, 8.), and whosoever is occupied with it is *exercised in wisdom*.

Διδάσκοντες is said to be for *διδάσκουσι*. Others subaud *ἐστι*, and take *διδάσκοντες* for the Imperative *διδάσκετε*. The former mode is preferable : and yet it may be more simple to regard *διδάσκ.* as a *nominativus pendens*. The Apostle seems to intend here to represent the natural *effect* of this *ἐνοικ. πλουσίως*. For as “ out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,” so a mind thus filled, and fervently exercised will, like a full fountain, overflow in praises

and thanks to God. Such is, I think, the scope of the words following, on whose sense I have especially treated at the parallel passage of Eph. 5, 19 & 20. But I would here add one or two observations. Our use of the Psalms of David, in preference to hymns of human composition, does not rest on any positive command of Scripture, but only on what may be inferred from 1 Cor. 14, 27 & 40. Yet, without subordination, how could it be *decided what* was according to order, decency, and edification? Power must be vested somewhere; and where so well as in one spiritual superior? In many respects the primitive mode of worship *may be*, but in not a few it ought *not to be*, a model for ours;* and as the Deity adapts both the ordinary and extraordinary dispensations of his Providence to the actual circumstances of the moral world in different ages and countries, so ought we to imitate that wisdom of the Deity. The extraordinary and miraculous gifts with which even the Laity were then endowed, made it not improper that every one should have liberty of speaking for the edification of the rest, especially when no Minister was present. But afterwards, as

* I may here appositely cite a passage from an Episcopal Visitation Sermon of mine, published nearly eleven years ago, p. 27. "In pure morals, in an humble disposition of the heart, in gratitude to God for having sent his Son into the world, in reverence and love to a crucified Redeemer, the primitive Church is a model for all succeeding ages. Yet it cannot, I think, be denied, that in the weightier matters of the law, in the duties of rendering justice and loving mercy, we have lights before us as clear as had the primitive Christians; and we have the additional benefit of numerous and holy examples which Ecclesiastical history records, and which have adorned the church of Christ through a long series of ages. Though in the present altered form of society it would be not less burthensome than it seems unnecessary, to observe literally some Apostolic injunctions; yet if we cherish a *spirit of docility*, if we keep in view the same grand end of teaching men to love God with all their heart, mind, and strength, to love their neighbour as themselves, to rest their hopes of salvation, not on their personal merits, but on the efficacy of that redemption which Christ hath accomplished for them, surely we direct Christianity to the noblest purposes, and have no reason to be ashamed as Ministers of God."

those extraordinary gifts were gradually withdrawn from the Laity, such a liberty would have been abused to licentiousness: therefore the authority of the Clergy was (most beneficially for the whole community) increased, and on *that* authority, and the decisions of the universal Church, it was determined that none but the Psalms of David should be used in *public* worship. It cannot, I think, be *proved* from the New Testament that any *uninspired hymns* were used in the public service of the primitive Christians; which is the point on which the controversy with the Dissenters hinges.

16. ἐν χάριτι ᾄδοντες. This is susceptible of more than one mode of interpretation. Some, as Heinrichs, takes it to mean *animo grato*. But that sense can hardly be admitted. Others, as Grot. and Rosenm. (with more probability), take it to be equivalent to בְּחַיִּיבִּי חַרִּיבִּי, *amabiliter, jucunde*. But this is somewhat frigid. Zanch and Gomar understand it of "the delight and profit of the hearers." So Theophyl.: μεθ' ἡδονῆς πνευματικῆς, as opposed to the *profane songs* of the Heathens. And this mode of interpretation seems to deserve the preference.

Ἐν καρδίαις is usually explained *ex animo*, i. e. not with the voice only, but with the heart. *That*, however, would require the *singular*. It should seem that this is closely connected with the preceding. The sense appears to be: "with spiritual and heartfelt joy." It *may*, however, with some antients, and, of the moderns, Dr. Mackn., be understood of the *spiritual gifts*.

17. καὶ πάν ὅ,τι—Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. On account of the πάντα following, πάν is treated by the Commentators as a nominative absolute. It may, however, be an accusative dependent on κατὰ, *quod attinet ad*. Grot. remarks that ποιεῖν, like the Heb. עָשָׂה, though sometimes applied to εἶπεν, is often, as here, taken in a laxer sense, so as to comprehend *saying* as well as *doing*: *for he who saith, acts*." The words πάν ὅ,τι are paraphrased by Theophyl.: ἐὰν ἐσθίης, ἐὰν πίνης

ἐὰν ἀποδημῆς, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ πράττε, τουτέστιν, αὐτὸν καλῶν βοηθὸν, πρότερον αὐτῷ εὐχόμενος, καὶ οὕτως ἅπτου τῶν ἔργων.

17. ἐν ὀνόματι Κ. Ἰ., "agreeably to his will, and suitably to his doctrine." Compare 1 Cor. 10, 31.

17. εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ. The δι' αὐτοῦ is variously explained. By Rosenm., "prop-ter Christum." Heinr. thinks it is pleonastic. But this cannot be admitted; and the interpretation above mentioned is too limited. The expression must include a reference to the *mediatorial office* of Christ. So Theophyl.: ὥσπερ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ προσήγαγεν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἡμῶν αὐτὸς προσάγει τῷ Πατρὶ, πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν μεσίτης ἡμῶν.

18. Having concluded the general, the Apostle now proceeds to particular precepts.

Ὡς ἀνήκεν, "as it is right and just." So Eph. 6, 1. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ δίκαιον. Rosenm.) And so Theophyl. interprets. See Eph. 5, 22, 24. and the note.

19. Compare Eph. 5, 25—fin. Πικραίν. in a passive or reciprocal sense signifies to *carry oneself bitterly*, and is used with πρὸς τινα, or ἐπὶ τινί. (Heinr.) And sometimes with a dative without a preposition; as in Philo 584. (cited by Wets.) ἐτέροις πικρ. and also 2, 135. ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀπειθοῦσι πικραίνεται. See Kypke and Loesner. I add Joseph. 314, 15. ἐδεῖτο συγγνώμην περὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἡμαρτημένων, καὶ μὴ γενέσθαι πικρὸν αὐτῷ. Soph. Phil. 254. πικρὸς θεοῖς where the Schol. explains ἔχθρος. Dionys. Hal. 1, 599, 25. πικρὸν ἄνδρα καὶ μισόδημον. The word signifies to *indulge a spirit* (whether carried into *effect* or not) of *irritability* and *exacerbation* not easily appeased. From the παροργίζετε of Eph. 6, 4.; some here confine it to *provocation*; which is, however, far too great a limitation. The extent of sense above detailed is required by the opposite ἀγαπάτε. Much more has been, and *might* be said; but as all is trite and unnecessary, I forbear.

20. τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε. Compare Eph. 6. 1—3.

and the notes. Rosenm. observes that this general command is to be restricted by the ἐν κυρίῳ understood, which is *expressed* at Eph. But this is too precarious a principle. It is better to say that as ἐν κυρίῳ occurs in the next clause, so it is *implied* here. Εὐαρεστον answers to the δίκαιον in Eph.

21. μὴ ἐρεθίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. Compare Eph. 6, 4. Ἐρεθίζετε answers to the παροργίζετε there. See 2 Cor. 9, 2. The verb is often found united with others expressive of what usually follows irritation, as λοιδορεῖν, τύπτειν, &c. See the philological Commentators. Ἴνα μὴ ἀθυμῶσιν, “lest they lose all heart, and despair;” since excessive severity destroys all alacrity of obedience, and induces a desponding, stupid, and hardened spirit. So Wets.: “ne, spe tam morosis placendi parentibus abjectâ, obedire negligant.” This sense of ἀθυμεῖν is of such perpetual occurrence in the classical writers (see Wets.) that one might wonder how any Commentator could have thought of so forced and frigid a sense as “ne vobis et ipsi irascantur,” a signification in which the word is used in some passages of the Old Testament; than which nothing can be more precarious evidence.

22. οἱ δοῦλοι—τὸν Θεόν. Compare, Eph. 6, 5—8. It is observable that the Apostle enlarges *more* on the duties of masters and servants, and for an obvious reason, since *there* more is to be done from a sense of religious duty and accountableness to God. The Apostle *seems* to leave the duty of the servant unlimited at κατὰ πάντα, not adding ἐν κυρίῳ, or the like; but he *in fact* limits it by a direct injunction to the master, at ver. 25. On the *sentiment* see Mackn.

I am surprised that Griesb. should not have received ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, which is supported by many excellent MSS. and the parallel passage of Ephes. The υ undoubtedly arose from the ω following; as in a thousand other cases. On the other hand, I should hesitate, with Greisb., to receive Κύριον for

Θεόν; since there are not merely critical, and perhaps fancied reasons (a concurrence of recensions) to be pleaded in its favour; whereas Κύριον somewhat savours of emendation, and seems to have been introduced to make the antithesis between the *human master* and the *divine Master* the stronger. But such niceties the Apostle little heeded.

23. καὶ πᾶν ὃ,τι ἐὰν ποιῇτε. “and whatsoever ye do,” viz. in your service. Ἐκ ψυχῆς *ex animo*. Ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, &c. “and regard your service as rendered to the Lord, and not unto men.”

24. εἰδότες—τῆς κληρονομίας. The Apostle now states the strongest of all motives for their doing this; anticipating the objection,—what shall we *gain* from our masters by such fidelity and diligence? little or nought. To which the answer is: “That may be; but from the Lord ye will receive τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας,” where the Commentators remark, the genitive is *exegetical*, i. e. “which consists in inheritance (in heaven).” See 2, 17. and Rom. 8, 17.

25. ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν κομιεῖται ὃ ἡδίκησε. In the interpretation of this verse the Commentators are divided in opinion as to what the ἀδικῶν is to be referred. Some say, to the servant; others, to the master. Others make it general. (See Doddr.) But the last method can by no means be admitted. Of the two first the former is supported by the context, and seems preferable. Yet in the προσωποληψία it is (I think) *hinted* that if the master do wrong, he shall receive punishment for it. So Theophyl.: ἀλλ’ οὖν καὶ οἱ δεσπόται ὑποδεχέσθωσαν τοῦτο καὶ ὡς αὐτοῖς ἀρμόζον. See also Theodoret. In this we may observe great delicacy; and the former is particularly mentioned, because, as Heinr. remarks, “mean persons often think they ought to be spared, because of their poverty and ignorance; which is here expressly denied, since God no more spares bad servants than bad masters.”

The expression κομ. ὃ ἡδικ. has been explained at

Eph. 6, 8. and 2 Cor. 5, 10. The term *κομ.* is used of evil as well as good. See Levit. 2, 17. Mackn. has of all our English Commentators best seen the sense. On *προσωποληψία* see Ephes. 6, 9. Gal. 2, 6. and James 2, 1.

CHAP. IV.

VER. 1. οἱ Κύριοι—παρέχεσθε. Compare Eph. 6, 9. The Apostle here expressly states (what at 3, 25. he only *hinted* at), the corresponding duty of masters to servants. The οἱ has here (as in some other phrases) the force of the pronoun personal. Παρέχεσθε, *præstate, yield in return.* So a Lexicographer ap. Wets. ἰθυντήριον τὸ κανονίζον καὶ ἰσότητα παρέχον. The τὸ δίκαιον and τὴν ἰσότητα are said to be synonymous. Yet a distinction might be made;* though it is not necessary, since the two terms are often so united, by a kind of popular idiom; as we say, “what is *just* and *right*.” Of the passage cited by Wets. the most apposite are the following: Thucyd. 2, 44. οὐ γὰρ οἶοντε ἴσον τὸ ἢ δίκαιον βουλευέσθαι. Epistola Philippi, πῶς ἐστι τοῦτ’ ἴσον ἢ δίκαιον; Demosth. ἴση καὶ δικαία εἰρήνη.

What is meant by the τὸ δικ. καὶ τὴν ἰσοτ. παρέχ. (with which compare, “do as you would be done by,” and “with the same mete that ye measure it shall be measured to you again,”) is very obvious; and the force of this popular phrase was too well understood to make it necessary for the Apostle to add any thing explanatory of its sense. Heinr. cannot conceive why the Apostle should be so brief on the reciprocal duty of masters. But it seems that the phrase suggests all that was necessary (see the Commentators); and it requires no Œdipus to see why the Apostle

* Thus Grot., after observing that there is a *jus* even between those who are not equals, says, that the δικ. answers to the Hebr. עֲקָרָה, the ἰσοτ. to כִּשְׁר.

should be brief and delicate on this head, considering that slaves formed so very considerable a part of the population, in some places far exceeding the free persons, as in our West India islands.

2—6. The Apostle now subjoins some more general precepts, on praying (which correspond to Eph. 6, 18. sq.), and a wise and prudent regulation of our lives, answering to Eph. 5, 15. sq. (Heinr.)

Here, all Commentators remark, ch. 4. ought to have commenced.

Προσκατερεῖν signifies to assiduously persevere in any thing, and is used of prayer in Acts 1, 14 & 46. 6, 4. Compare Rom. 12, 12. 13, 6. The phrase γρηγ. ἐν αὐτῇ, which denotes watchful diligence in or about any thing, is added, to strengthen the sense. So 1 Pet. 4, 7. νήψατε, εἰς τὰς προσευχὰς.

2. ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. Here ἐν is for σὺν; and εὐχαριστία signifies *thanksgiving*. For as Davison and Grot. remark, “conjungi debet grata exacti temporis (et acceptorum beneficiorum) memoria cum futuri postulatione.” It is observed by Theophyl. that that is true prayer which unites thanks for all the events which have befallen us, whether prosperous or adverse. “No one (says Rosenm.) can neglect the duty of prayer, who often thinks of the benefits he has received, and returns thanks to God for them.”

3. προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν. With prayer the Apostle conjoins a mention of himself, as at Eph. 6, 15., desires their prayers; chiefly (as it should seem) to hint to them the duty of prayer for *each other*, as well as for themselves, and how much they *all* stood in need of it. On the efficacy of such prayer the Apostle often treats as at Phil. 1, 19. and Hebr. 13, 19. This passage (Mackn. observes) affords instruction both to ministers, and to their people: to ministers, not to despise an assistance which even an inspired Apostle thought useful to him. And to the people, to be careful to assist their ministers with an help which in the end will greatly redound to their own benefit.”

3. ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου. On θύρα in this figurative sense see Acts 14, 27. 1 Cor. 16, 9. and 2 Cor. 2, 12., and the notes. The phrase must signify that the Lord would give him an opportunity (i. e. a further and more favourable opportunity) of preaching the Gospel of Christ,* namely, *by being set at liberty*. That such is the sense (though the Commentators have not distinctly seen it) is clear from what follows.

On μυστήριον, as applied to the *Gospel*, and especially that most profound part of it, the calling of the Gentiles, I have before treated. See 1, 26. and elsewhere.

4. ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ, ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. Φαν. has the sense of *declare, teach*; as in Rom. 1, 19. But it is here appropriate to the μυστήριον. The words ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι are susceptible of more than one meaning. Rosenm. renders it, “suitably to my office:” and Davison and Gomar, *optimo modo, verè, constanter, prudenter*. But this cannot be the sense. Preferable is the exposition of Grot.: “non tantum ut magnum mihi det Deus auditorium, sed et fortitudinem animi, et eloquendi copiam.” And he refers to 1 Cor. 9, 16. It should, however, seem that the Apostle is alluding to that liberty which would give him an *opportunity* of preaching the Gospel in such a way as he was bound to do, being Apostle of the Gentiles, and chiefly by having the παρρησία. Theophyl. well explains thus: ἵνα παρρησίαν μοι δῶ, οὐχ ὅπως ἀπαλλαγῶ τῶν δεσμῶν, ἀλλ’ ὅπως λαλήσω τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι· τουτέστι, μὴ μετὰ ὑποστολῆς, ἀλλ’ εὐπαρρησιάστως. Πῶς δὲ δεδεμένος ἐτέρους παρακάλει καὶ ἄξιοι λαβεῖν ὃ εἶχεν;

5. ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω. By the τοὺς ἕξω are plainly meant “all who are not of the fold of

* Wets. here compares Pind. Olymp. 6. χρὴ τοίνυν πύλας ὕμνων ἀναπίπταμεν αὐταῖς· and Clem. Strom. 6. οὐδὲ γὰρ ῥᾶστον ἔπειν πύλας ἐξευρεῖν. And so Cic. Ep. 13, 10. (cited by Heinr.) amicitia fore aperiantur.

Christ," whether Jews, or Heathens. See 1 Cor. 12, 13. The scope of the admonition, taken in connection with what precedes, seems to be to enjoin the exercise of prudence in avoiding whatever may give unnecessary offence. On the τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραῶ. I have copiously treated at Eph. 5, 16. But the interpretation which I have there adopted will (I grant) not be suitable to the present passage, which seems rather to require that of Grot., Hamm., and Whitby on that passage. See, however, Chrys. and Theophyl.

6. The Apostle seems here to mean to give them an admonition as to the *mode* in which any conversation with the Heathens should be maintained. Their discourse, he says, is to be ἐν χάριτι, ἁλuti ἡρτυμένος, on which words Commentators are by no means agreed. Many understand χάριτι of *divine grace*. But that would here seem harsh. The antients interpret ἐν χάριτι by ἐπίχαρις. And so the most judicious moderns, *courteous, agreeable, not morose and melancholy*. But on ἁλuti ἡρτυμένος they are divided in opinion. Most antients take it of *spiritual wisdom*. Theophyl. paraphrases thus: ἐχέτω μὲν χαριεντισμὸν ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν· πλὴν μὴ εἰς ἀδιαφορίαν ἐκπιπτέτω καὶ ἐκλυσιν, ἀλλ' ἔστω καὶ στύφων· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἅλuti δηλοῖ· μήτε πέρα τοῦ μέτρου ἐπίχαρις ἔσο, μήτε αὖ αὐστηρός. But, however agreeable to the *intention* of the Apostle, I see not how such a sense can be elicited from the *words*. It is evident that the Apostle is here speaking of *moral* qualities, prudence and discretion, not *religious* ones. Considering, then, the context, I agree with those eminent moderns, who interpret the ἁλuti ἡρτυμένος of that *prudence and discretion* which regards place, time, and persons. Yet there may be, too, an allusion to that kind of *neatness of phraseology* which the Apostle deemed it not unworthy of Christians to aim at in their conversation with Heathens, in order to procure greater respect to the Gospel. Thus the words following admit of an easy

connexion, where at εἰδέναι must be supplied εἰς τὸ, or ὥστε; “Thus (i. e. by the exercise of this prudence and wisdom) will ye be able to know when and how to give an answer to every Heathen *enquirer*, or *objector*, and that suitably to his station, or knowledge; and by the cultivation of this neatness of phraseology your answers will be better pointed, and produce greater effect.” Such appears to be the real and complete sense of the passage on which the notions of the Commentators seem very confused.

7. Now comes the last section of the Epistle, which corresponds to Eph. 6, 21. (though longer), and in which (as he usually does at the conclusion of his Epistles) the Apostle speaks of himself, or gives a special injunction with respect to certain persons, concluding with benedictory and valedictory phrases. (Heinr.) Rosenm. observes, that we may hence infer that Tychicus had been to take a journey through Phrygia. On ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς and σύνδουλος, see supra 1, 7. and Phil. 2, 25.

8. ἵνα γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, “That he may obtain a knowledge of your affairs, and make report to me.” This anxiety of the Apostle to have that knowledge appears from supra 2, 1. On the sense of παρακαλ. τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν see supra 2, 2.

9. σὺν Ὁνησίμῳ—ὃς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν. The σὺν Ὁν. connects with ἐπεμψα. Ὁς ἐ. ἐ. ὅς, “who is descended from your nation, who is your countryman.” See the Epistle to the Philipp., where Theodoret says that Onesimus (which, however, was a very common name) was a Phrygian. See also Mackn. in loc.

9. πάντα ὑμῖν γνωριοῦσι τὰ ὧδε, i. e. “they will tell you the state of our affairs, both as respects myself and others.” The τὰ ὧδε, however, may include *every* sort of intelligence which would be interesting to them as Christians. On the similar words of ver. 7. Chrys. and Theophyl. remark on the wisdom of the Apostle in not inserting *every thing* in his Epistle that those whom he addressed would wish to

know, but leaving the minuter and secular matters to the letter-bearers. That this was usual in antient times I have before shewn. And, we may observe, there was in the case of Paul a delicate propriety, and a kindness and respect to the letter-bearers, by leaving them something to say. So Theophyl. remarks that the Apostle adopted this course, first, that his Epistles might not be too long; secondly, that he who went with them might have something to relate, and be on that account looked upon more respectfully; thirdly, that he might show his good opinion of such persons, and the regard he had for them, by this confidence placed in them; and because he might have some things to communicate, not so proper for being committed to writing."

10. Ἀρίσταρχος. See Acts 19, 29. 20, 4. 27, 2. and Philem. 24. And not uncommon name in Greece, and rendered celebrated by having been borne by the great Grammarian. On this person see the instructive note of Mackn.

10. ὁ συναιχμαλωτός μου. The Commentators here raise a difficulty, because in this place *Aristarchus* is called prisoner; but in Philem. 23, *Epaphras*. Yet both might be in bonds; and surely St. Paul was at liberty to mention in one Epistle the bonds of the former, and in another the bonds of the latter. (Heinr.)

10. Μάρκος ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα. *Ανεψιὸς*, as we learn from Phrynichus, was by the Attics applied to any one's ἐξάδελφος, i. e. either *patruelis*, or *amitinus*, or *consobrinus*; for by these three words the one in question is rendered in the Glosses. Marcus, it may be observed, had now become more courageous since what is related in Acts 15, 39. and therefore was now in great regard with Paul. (Comp. Tim. 4, 11.) (Rosenm.) See Whitby.

10. περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, "as to whom (i. e. Marcus) ye have received my directions." *What* these were we know not. Pearce thinks that ἐντολ. may import *urgent requests*. See Acts 17, 15. and 2 Tim.

4, 11. Yet I agree with Mackn., that these were orders given with Apostolical authority; but whether *verbal* (as he thinks), or *in writing*, I would not venture to determine. Δέξασθε αὐτὸν, “receive him with the respect due to a faithful minister of Christ.” So in 3 Joh. 8. it is said of itinerant ministers: Ἡμεῖς οὖν ὀφείλομεν ἀπολαμβάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους, ἵνα συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

11. Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουστὸς, “Jesus, who is called Justus, also saluteth you.” A common name among the Jews. Grot. and Rosenm. think that the ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουστὸς signifies that he was so called by the Romans. On which custom of adding to the Jewish name a Roman one similar to it, see Grot. on Acts 13, 9.

11. οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, “all of whom are of the circumcision,” i. e. Jewish Christians. The Apostle then adds, οὗτοι μόνοι—παρεγορία, where the phraseology is brief and idiotical, and consequently somewhat obscure. Οὗτοι is for οἱ καὶ. By μόνοι is meant, as Chrys. and almost all Commentators think, “of the *Jews* alone;” and perhaps rightly; at least *Luke* and *Timothy* were then at Rome.

11. συνεργοὶ ε. τ. β. τ. Θ. can require no explanation. Οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι παρηγορία. This seems to be a brief mode of expression for, “and who have indeed been such, and a great comfort to me.” Now they might have been fellow-labourers without being *personally* a comfort to the Apostle; which is here implied. The Jewish Christians in general were too wedded to prejudice and bigotry to cordially promote the Apostle’s views, or be any *comfort* to him; though they might be, in a certain sense, his *fellow-labourers*.

12. ἀσπάζεται υἱὰς Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ ἐξ υἱῶν, “Epaphras your countryman (see the note *supra* ver. 9, and therefore not the same, as some say, with the Epaphras mentioned at Philipp.) salutes you.” Πάντοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ υἱῶν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, “continually offering up fervent prayers in your behalf.” See the

note supra 2, 1. ἵνα στήτε τέλειοι καὶ πεπληρωμένοι, &c. The στήτε is thought by Heinr. to be equivalent to ἦτε. But there rather seems to be a blending of two metaphors. The force of στήτε is the same as at Eph. 6, 13. καὶ πάντα κατεργασάμενοι στήναι· Στήτε οὖν, &c. See also Philipp. 1, 27 and 28. Gal. 5, 1. So Theophyl.: ἐπειδὴ δὴ ἐνι τέλειον μὲν εἶναι, μὴ ἐστάναι δὲ, ὥσπερ ὅταν τις πάντα μὲν εἰδῇ, μὴ ἐσθήκοι δὲ βεβαίως, διὰ τοῦτο φησιν, ἵνα στήτε τέλειοι, ἐν τε τῷ δόγματι δηλαδὴ, καὶ ἐν τῷ βίῳ· On τέλειοι see 1 Cor. 2, 6. and Eph. 4, 13. and the notes. Πεπληρωμένοι, “filled and thoroughly prepared with all spiritual gifts and graces and divine aids.” See Schleus. Lex. on πληρόω· Ἐν παντὶ θελήματι is for εἰς τὸ πᾶν θέλημα. So Eph. 3, 19. ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The sense is: “the will of God, and that only.” For, as Theoph. observes, τοῦτο τὸ πεπληρωθῆαι καὶ τὸ τελειῶσθαι.

13. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει ζῆλον. It is strange that Heinr. and others should think πόνον instead of ζῆλον is the true reading; and that Griesb. should have edited it. The various readings, πόθον, ἄγωνα, κόπον, and πόνον are all but glosses on ζῆλον: whereas had πόνον been the original reading, it is difficult to see how the rest could have arisen. Besides, the common reading is confirmed by a kindred passage of Rom. 10, 2. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν. The phrase ἔχειν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ τινός, signifies to be desirous to promote any one's interests, accompanied with exertions to do it. See 2 Cor. 7, 7.

With respect to Laodicea and Hierapolis, they are both in Phrygia. On the latter, which was in the vicinity of Loadicea, Wets. has collected many passages from the Classical writers, especially the Geographers, to which I would add a very curious one from an Orator of Procopius Gaz. ap. Villos Anecd. H. 41. πόλις ἐστὶν ἱερὰ, τὸν πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνισχόντων, πολυάνθρωπος, ἐκ τῆς εὐσεβείας φέρουσα γνώρισμα, καὶ ταῖς θεαῖς τελεταῖς τῶν ἄλλων προβεβλημένη· ἦθεν εἰς ταύτην φοιτῶσιν Ἰνδοὶ, καὶ Πέρσαι, καὶ Φοίνικες, καὶ Σκυθῶν

γένῃ, καὶ τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Ἰωνία τε πᾶσα· καὶ ὥσπερ τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους κοινὴν τις ἀνείποι πατρίδα· αὕτη τῶν υἰάτων ἐνδεία, μετὰ τῶν οἰκητόρων καὶ τοὺς πανταχόθεν ὄντας ἐλύπει· τοσαῦτα γὰρ παρείχεν, ὅσα τῶν ὀμβρων ἢ τύχῃ· καὶ ἀντ' ἄλλου τινὸς, υἰάτων θησαυροὺς ἐπεποίητο.

14. ἀσπάζεται υἱὰς Λουκᾶς ὁ ἱατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς. It has been the almost unanimous opinion of Commentators both antient and modern, that this is Luke the Evangelist, who is from this passage *alone*, Rosenm. says, supposed to have been a physician. But this I should be inclined to doubt: and I can by no means agree with those who, as Calvin, Heuman, and Rosenm., think that if St. Paul had here meant his well known companion, he would have simply called him *Luke*; as at 2 Tim. 4, 12., from which they infer that the ἱατρὸς indicates that this was *another* Luke; as the name was not uncommon. But how inclusive is such an argument it is needless for me to point out. Thus even Heinr. (sufficiently prone to innovation) admits that Luke the Evangelist is meant.

Demas, Bengel observes, is the only one *sine elogio*. There are several such at Rom. 16.

15. Νυμφᾶν, καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν. Grot. thinks that Νυμφ. is a contract name for Nymphodorus. Compare 2 Tim. 4, 10. This person had a church or congregation in his house, of which mention is made at Rom. 16, 5. 1 Cor. 16, 19. and Philem. 2. where see the notes. From the καὶ Grot. would infer that Nymphas lived not at Laodicea, but in the vicinity. This, however, seems precarious. (Heinr.)

16. καὶ ὅταν—ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωθῇ. There has been some difference of opinion respecting the force of the τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας. On which it may be sufficient to refer my readers to the notes of Whitby and Doddr., (both being Commentators whom I presume few of them are without): and I will offer only one or two remarks.

There is no reason to conclude that the words

refer to a *lost* Epistle to the Laodiceans; and I am surprised Doddr. should maintain so precarious, not to say dangerous, a position as that "all the Epistles of the Apostles are not preserved, any more than all the words and actions of our Lord." The two cases are quite different; and the position is not only unfounded, but (as I said) *dangerous*. Here we need only suppose, (with the most eminent Commentators, down to Heinr.,) that the Epistle in question is that to the *Ephesians*, and that that was what is called an *encyclical* one. And although this does not admit of *proof*, yet it is so highly probable that we may very well acquiesce in it.

17. καὶ εἶπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, i. e. "say to Archippus in my name." This person had discharged the office of *Evangelista* sometimes at Ephesus, sometimes elsewhere. See Philem. 2. He seems to have last resided, and to have been then resident at Colosse, and there to have discharged the office of *President*, ruling Presbyter, now called κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *Bishop*. (Grot.) Some, as Heinr., think he was now discharging that office in the place of Epaphras. From the words of the address it has been by most Commentators supposed that he had been inattentive to the duties of his station, and that they are intended to convey a reproof. But this is so inconsistent with the commendatory manner in which he is mentioned by the Apostle to Philemon, that it cannot (I think) be admitted. Nor is such a conclusion at all necessary. We might as well suppose the admonition to Timothy at 2 Tim. 1, 6. to "stir up the gift of God in him," implies reproof for negligence. Such language as this is only to be understood as exciting to renewed activity, for which, considering the then state of the Colossian Church (beset with false teachers) there would be especial need.

With respect to the phraseology, it is by many thought to savour of Hebrew pleonasm. But similar modes of expression are sometimes found in the Classical writers. The words may be simply ren-

dered : “ Look to* thy office which thou receivedst at the hands of the Lord, and for the promotion of his glory.” Thus, we may observe, a Bishop or Priest may (by the medium of those who consecrate him) be said to receive his office from the Lord, the Head of the Church. So Theophyl.

Of *πληροῦν* and *fungi*, joined with words denoting office, Wets. and Kypke adduce numerous examples, none of which (as the phrase is so very frequent) need I select.

18. ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. Hence it is plain, that all that precedes was written by the hand of a scribe, and this clausula alone by the hand of the Apostle. So 1 Cor. 16, 21. 2 Thess. 3, 17. (Rosenm.) Yet he thus acknowledges the preceding to his own. (Heinr.)

18. μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν. Some explain : “ Be mindful to relieve me while under these bonds.” But nothing can be less accordant to the spirit of the Apostle than this. The expression is similar to that in Hebr. 13, 3.; and the sense (as the best Commentators antient and modern are agreed) is : “ Be mindful of, feel love for, pray for me, and imitate the courage with which I bear persecution for the Gospel’s sake.”

* So Arrian Diss. Epict. L. 3. ch. 23. (cited by Rosenm.) ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον βλέπετε.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.*

CHAP. I.

Of the contents of this Epistle Schoettg. gives the following plan. 1. Proeme, ch. 1. 2. A commendation for the facility with which they were converted, ch. 2. 3. A commendation for their steadfastness in their Christian profession, ch. 3. It is true the Apostle here and elsewhere introduces such commendatory matter, for the purpose of both of making the greater impression on the minds of his readers, and confirming them the more in their constancy. 4. Practical matter, 4, 5, 12—22. 5. A treating on the times of future things, 5, 1—11.

VERSE 1. Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος, *Silvanus*. A not unfrequent name among the Romans. This Silvanus (i. e. the Silas of the Acts,) was Paul's companion in his journey through Asia Minor and Greece (see Acts 15, 22. 16, 19. 17, 1 and 10); and also took Timothy with him when he went into Macedonia. Both their names are, therefore, united by the Apostle with his own, as being well known to the Gentile converts at Thessalonica. (Rosenm.) Grotius thinks they had relations in Thessalonica. But that is mere conjecture.

1. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων, ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ, κ. κ. I. X. Rosenm. here supposes an ellipsis of "qui perductus est ad finem:" and he takes in the sense of *per*. But this is too arbitrary. The common and

* Or rather, as Markland has fully proved, *Thessalonicians*.

best founded opinion is, that there is an ellipsis of οὔσης. But to render it by *is*, is being too literal and inartificial. Mackn. interprets it *subject to*; which is too arbitrary. The sense seems to be, “who are founded in and joined to Christ.” See 1 Joh. 5, 20. Some antients and moderns, as Grot., think no mention is made of Presbyters and Deacons, because the congregation as yet consisted of but few. But that (as Koppe observes) is refuted by the Introductions of the other Epistles, where he addresses churches fully constituted without any mention of such.

2, 3. εὐχαριστοῦμεν—ἡμῶν. The same is expressed at Rome 1, 8. and 9. Eph. 1, 16. where see the notes. It is observed by Koppe, that the plural throughout the Epistle is to be referred to Paul only; though Timothy and Silvanus are joined in the salutation. Compare 3, 1 and 2. The πάντοτε and ἀδιαλείπτως are to be taken *populariter*, like our *perpetually*, i. e. at every return of prayer. Ἀδιολείπτως μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως “as often as we remember your work of faith.” The recent Commentators take ἔργου τῆς πίστεως for πίστεως. But it rather has reference to the zeal and diligence which they had evinced in attaining unto this faith, and their constancy in persevering in it. So Theophyl. explains it ἐνστάσεως ὑμῶν τὸ στερεῶς ἵστασαι. And so Theodoret: τὸ ἐν κινδύνοις βέβαιον. See Joh. 6, 29. and Phil. 1, 6. Benson thinks it denotes the practice of all those good works required in consequence of embracing the Christian faith. But this seems unfounded.

3. καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος. On the exact sense of these words Commentators are not agreed. Koppe avoids the difficulty, by regarding them as simply put for τῆς ἀγάπης and τῆς ἐλπίδος. But against this slovenly method of wrapping up matters I can never cease to protest. It is only a decent way of shuffling off the difficulty. Τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης is well explained by Schleus. “ardentissimum mutuæ benevolentiae studium.” Of

this (as Theophyl. observes) they had given a *proof* in the circumstances narrated at Acts 17. And it is remarked by Grot., that love is *much*, but labour is *more*. In the present clause the first substantive stands for an adjective. Thus ὑπομονή τῆς ἐλπίδος signifies, “your long and patient enduring hope,” *spei certæ et inconcussæ*, as Schleus. explains. We shall see the significance and propriety of this expression, when we consider the many temptations they underwent to abandon the faith, both from Jews and Gentiles.

3. τοῦ Κυρίου, Vorst. observes, denotes partly the efficient cause; partly the object of the preceding virtues.

3. ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν. This formula must be referred to the πίστεις, ἀγάπης, and ἐλπίδος, and (as some antients and most moderns think) is meant (by a Hebraism taken from לפייה יה) to denote that they are sincere and zealous. Rosenm. refers to Vorst. de Hebr. p. 399 and 463. Fisch.

4. εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἡμῶν. It is strange that many modern Commentators (as Eras. and Zeger) should refer the εἰδότες to the Thessalonians, as if they knew that they were elected of God: which is supposing a harsh anacoluthon very needlessly: whereas if it be referred (as the context requires) to *Paul* (since the *participle* is used both before and after), all is natural and straight forward. So *all* the antients, and most of the moderns, even some Calvinists, as Doddr. See the note on 3, 5. “The election spoken of (says Whitby) is the election to be a church.” (See his note.) As to the notion of absolute election of individuals, it is refuted by 3, 5. 5, 14. 2 Thess. 3, 11. And so the antients took the words. See Chrysost., Theophyl., and Œcumen.

On the construction Commentators are not quite agreed. Some join ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ with the preceding; others, with the following. The *former* seems pre-

ferable, and is not only supported by the authority of some antient Versions and Commentators, but is adopted by the best moderns. Propriety of language, too, seems to require this: for otherwise (as Benson says) we should have had τῶν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν. A yet stronger argument is deduced from 2 Thess. 2, 15. and Col. 3, 12.

5. ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον — πληροφῳρία πολλῇ. The terms here employed are very strong, and ought not to have been lowered and explained away, as they are done by most recent Commentators, whose interpretation indeed yields a tolerable sense,* but with a far less natural construction, and with violence to the plain and obvious sense of the passage, which had been distinctly seen by the antients, and was admitted by the moderns up to the last half century.

5. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, “our preaching of the Gospel.” Ἐγενήθη, “was not affected.” Εἰς ὑμᾶς, for ὑμῖν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει, καὶ ἐν Πνευμ. ἁγ. These three particulars are opposed to the bare λόγῳ unaccompanied with any thing more. The δυνάμει has reference (as the best Commentators are agreed) to ministry worked by Paul; and the πν. ἁγ. (I should conceive) to the spiritual gifts which were imparted by him to some members of the Thessalonian Church; as at Corinth and Galatia. So Theoph., who explains: “from this it is plain that ye are elect, from God’s glorifying the preaching of the word among you. For we did not simply *preach*, but there were also signs of God’s approving that faith.” See also Benson. Some take δυνάμει in conjunction with πν. ἁγ. to denote the supernatural power of Paul’s preaching, and its efficacy on the heart. But this may be *included* in the preceding.

5. ἐν πληροφῳρία πολλῇ. On the sense of this

* Thus Rosenm. renders: “Nam doctrinam nostram persuasimus vobis non tantum institutione, sed etiam demonstratione insignis vis divinæ, et multis firmissimis argumentis.”

clause Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Grot., would unite it with the preceding ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, supposing an hendiadis. But this seems paring down the sense. Others refer it to Paul's παρρησία. But this cannot be tolerated. It must be referred to the Thessalonians; and I think (with Theophyl., Œcumen., Hesych., and, of the moderns, Zanch, Benson, Rosenm., and Schleus.), that it is equivalent to βεβαιώτης; and that σὺν is understood; q. d. "it was accompanied with certain assurance of the truth of the Gospel." The force of the metaphor is derived from a ship under full sail, and may therefore well express *full assurance* and complete conviction. So Heb. 6, 11. πληροφ. τῆς ἐλπίδος and 10, 22. ὁ πληροφ. τῆς πίστεως.

5. καθὼς οἶδατε οἱοι ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν. The scope of this clause, which is indistinct, has not been well perceived by the Commentators. The Apostle (I conceive) meant to advert to *another evidence* of the truth of the Gospel, namely, from the *conduct of the preacher of it*. The καθὼς may be rendered *especially as*. Οἶος here, as almost always, is used in a good sense. It is well explained by Theophyl.: πῶς ἀνεστράφημεν. The Apostle alludes to purity, disinterestedness (even working with his hands, 2, 9.), and other moral virtues by which his sincerity and the truth of the Gospel was *proved*. What is here only *hinted* at in οἶον ἐγεν., is fully *expressed* infra 2, 10. ὑμεῖς μαρτύρες ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμεμπτῶς ὑμῖν ἐγενήθημεν. In ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ὑμᾶς Pisc. thinks there is a *polyptoton*. But it is rather (I conceive) a *paronomasia*. The force of δι' ὑμᾶς (which is not well discerned by the Commentators) is, "for your sakes, for your good, not our own private interest." Mackn. well contrasts this disinterestedness with the covetousness and profligacy of the philosophers of that age.

6. καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου. There is here plainly an ellipsis of some clause, which must be supplied, to indicate the connection.

Benson offers the following: “(And we can bear witness to your amiable behaviour) for,” &c. Mack.: “And, being exceedingly struck with our miracles and virtues, ye became,” &c. I would propose (partly from Menoch.) the following: “(Nor was our labour fruitless, or our example set you in vain) *for* ye were imitators,” &c. The force of the *μιμηται* is, by most Commentators, confined to the bearing afflictions, as Jesus Christ and Paul had done. But I cannot help thinking, with Zanch, Grot., and Doddr., that a *general* imitation of Christ and the Apostle is meant, (as in 1 Cor. 4, 16. & 11, 1.), though consisting chiefly in that stedfast faith and endurance of persecution for the truth’s sake, which is the stamp of all other Christian virtues; q. d. “ye were imitators of me and the Lord in the general holiness of your lives, and especially in that patient endurance of persecution, to which, after having received the word, ye were exposed.” See *infra* 2, 14.

The clause *δεξάμενοι—αγίου*, from the flexibility of the phraseology, admits of two or three renderings, though with no great diversity of sense. Much depends upon the mode in which *δεξάμενοι* is to be taken. If it be taken (with Pisc.) for *ἄτε ἐδέξασθε*, “inasmuch as ye received,” it will supply a proof of their being true imitators of Christ. But if it be taken (with most Commentators, antient and modern) for “*having received* the Gospel,” the scope will be somewhat different; and the phrases *ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ* and *μετὰ χαρᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγ.* must be introduced with an *although* and a *yet*; which is harsh (see Doddr. and Mackn.); q. d. having embraced the Gospel, though it brought on you much affliction, yet mitigated by the joy of the Holy Ghost.” The *former* method seems preferable, and the construction may be thus traced: *δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ*. I cannot, however, agree with some recent Commentators who render *μετὰ χαρᾶς libentissimè*; as Acts 2, 41. *ἁσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον*. There is, doubtless

(as the antient and the best modern Commentators are agreed) an allusion to the joy of the Holy Spirit which accompanied and rewarded their alacrity in receiving the word, and their firmness in adhering to it, and which was (as Benson and Mackn. observe) an evidence of their election, and a pledge of their title to a happy immortality.

7. ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπους, “Insomuch that ye became exemplars and models to all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia.” On τυπ. see 1 Cor. 10, 6 & 11. Phil. 3, 17. and the notes. Koppe observes that Macedonia and Achaia were the two provinces into which Greece was divided when brought under the Roman yoke, one of which comprehended Macedonia proper, with Illyricum, Epirus, and Thessaly; the other Greece proper, i. e. antient Greece.

8. ἀφ’ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται—ἐξελήλυθεν, “For not only from you sounded forth the word of the Lord unto Macedonia,” &c. The οὐ μόνον (per hyperbaton) must (as Grot., Rosenm., and Koppe are agreed) be united with ἐξήχηται (see Rom. 4, 12. and Heb. 11, 3.), the comma being removed after Κυρίου. It is remarked by Koppe, that the formulas ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος and πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν are placed in opposition. Compare Joel 3, 14. and Sir. 40, 13.

Ἐξήχηται, “sounded like a trumpet.” So Pollux 1, 113. ἐξήχησε βροντῇ, and Hesych. ἐξήχηται ἐκέρυχθη. Ἀφ’ ὑμῶν does *not* denote (as Storr thought) the *efficient cause*; but it signifies *commencing from you*. Nor has the *sounding forth* any relation (as Koppe supposes) to the Apostle’s own progress through the district, which would destroy the propriety and beauty of the passage; but the meaning is, that the truths of the Gospel were disseminated from Thessalonica, which, from its dignity as capital of one of the two provinces of Macedonia, and its extensive commerce, would have communication with far distant regions (for that is, by hyperbole, the sense of ἐν παντί τόπῳ, and not, as Koppe renders, “wherever I go”), and the same intercourse would spread the

news of the conversion of the Thessalonians far and wide.

8. ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν, “se divulgavit,” “has been carried.” Benson has an excellent note on this *going out* of the Gospel from any place, as being the greatest honour it could have. Compare Ps. 19, 4. and Rom. 10, 18. He shows how highly honoured in that respect was *Antioch*, and especially *Jerusalem*; as had been prophesied. See Is. 2, 3. and Macc. 4, 2. So St. Paul at 1 Cor. 14, 36. “What, came the word of God out from you?” i. e. are you the first Church in the world? Theophyl. paraphrases thus: ἡ περὶ τῆς ὑμῶν φήμη ἀρετῆς ἐποίησεν ἐξάκουστον γενέσθαι πᾶσι τὸ κήρυγμα, καὶ πάντων ὑμᾶς παιδευτὰς δειχθῆναι.

9. αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὅποιαν εἴσοδον ἔχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. By αὐτοὶ Grot. and Rosenm. understand *persons every where*. But the nature of ἀπαγγ. seems rather to show that αὐτοὶ must mean the *Thessalonians* who sounded out the word of God every where. As to the construction, it is the κατὰ τὸ σημαινόμενον. Περὶ ἡμῶν, “concerning us.” Ὅποιαν, *qualem, how successful*; for that is implied in ὅποιαν (as often in such kind of words), and not, as Rosenm. supposes, in εἴσοδον; as is clear from 2, 1., which is closely connected with this passage; the words καὶ πῶς—ἐρχομένης being in some degree parenthetical.

9. πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, “how promptly.” (So Theophyl. εὐκόλως, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σφοδρότητος) ye turned from the worship of idols to that of the true God. Ἐπιστρ. has here (as Koppe and Rosenm. observe) a reciprocal force, as at Luke 17, 4. Acts 3, 19. And so our verb *to turn* admits of both an active and a reciprocal. *To turn any one unto God*, or *to turn oneself unto*, denotes what is called *conversion*, the abandonment of any religion, and the embracing of another, or the passing from Atheism to religion. The words following are exegetical, and show the intent of this ἐπιστρ., namely (εἰς τὸ) δουλέειν Θεῷ ᾧ ζῶντι, i. e. to worship and obey, &c.; for

such is the sense of δουλεύειν, derived from the Heb. עָבַד, from whence the Latin *obedio*. The expression *living and true God*, as opposed to *dumb idols* and *fictitious Gods*, is of very frequent occurrence both in the Scriptures and also Josephus and Philo. Theophyl. observes that this is meant to hint an admonition to a conduct worthy of such a wonderful conversion; and (as Benson observes) “the reminding them of this would be a motive to them to go on as they had begun.”

10. καὶ ἀναμένειν—Ἰησοῦν. The ἀναμένειν depends upon εἰς τὸ. Koppe and Rosenm. notice the hyperbaton for Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἡγείρεν, and the use of ῥύομεν for ῥυσόμενον. But the former criticism is precarious; and the latter unnecessary. It *may* mean “who is to free us.” Ὁργῆς imports *punishment*; for *wrath* can only be ascribed to God ἀνθρωποπαθῶς. See Benson. As to Koppe, he here, as often, abuses his knowledge by seeking needless refinements, and indulging in foolish and dangerous speculations.

No Commentator has sufficiently seen the force of the εἰς τὸ ἀναμένειν, which seems meant to show the *other* fundamental article of Christianity, namely, to *receive Jesus Christ as the Saviour*. Now this is expressed by *waiting for him*, and expecting his advent from heaven; which is beautifully put for the *receiving him as the Saviour*, obeying his precepts, and living in the profession of his religion. This, it may be observed, is here especially appropriate, with reference to the trials and calamities with which they had had to struggle, and under which “the patient waiting for of their Saviour” and deliverer was their only support. So Gal. 5, 5. “we wait for the hope.” Rom. 8, 19. “waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.” Rom. 8, 25. “we groan, waiting for the adoption.” 1 Cor. 1, 7. “waiting for the coming of our Lord.” 2 Thess. 3, 5. “unto the patient waiting for of Christ.” It is well observed by Theophyl.: ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν δεινὰ ἐν χερσὶ, τὰ δὲ χρηστὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι, μεγάλην αὐτοῖς προσμαρτυρεῖ πίστιν, εἶγε ἀναμένουσι καὶ ἐλπίζουσι βεβαίως τὰ μέλλοντα.

CHAP. II.

VER. 1. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε—γέγονεν. The connexion is here not well traced by the Commentators; and Koppe and Rosenm. recognize *none*, by taking the γὰρ as a particle of transition. But this is precarious and unnecessary; and the connexion will be clear, if (as I observed at 1, 9.) the words καὶ πῶς—ἐρχομένης be regarded as in some measure parenthetical. The γὰρ refers to the ὅποιαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν. And the sense may be thus expressed: “(I need scarcely have said it) *for* you yourselves know,” &c.

The Hellenism in οἶδατε τὴν εἴσοδον ἡμῶν ὅτι γέγονεν for οἶδατε ὅτι ἡ εἴσοδος, &c., is trite. On the sense of the κενή, which, from its flexibility, admits of various senses, Commentators are not agreed. Many ancients interpret it, “free of danger and fear.” But this sense is inapposite. Most moderns, as Grot. and Hamm., explain it *false, lying*. But this interpretation is harsh; as is also that of Rosenm. and Koppe, who take it for μάταιον, and render: “non vero honoris vel opum acquirendarum studio ad vos venimus; Veni ad vos eo consilio et studio ut vobis prodessem, non ut otiosè inter vos viverem.” If the connexion above traced be the true one, it must be taken, with Menoch., Est., and Gomar, in the sense *sine fructu, inutile*. And that that is the real connection, and this the sense, I am the more inclined to believe, since I find the very acute and able Benson has anticipated all that I have said, and come to the same conclusion. He rightly ascribes the variety of interpretations to the solicitude of Commentators to preserve a connection with what follows, and from their supposing that the Apostle is there explaining what he means by his saying our coming unto you was not in vain.” The meiosis in οὐ κενή is very obvious. Benson confirms the above interpretation from 1, 5. 2, 13 & 14. 3, 5. 2 Thess. 3, 1 s. 12, 4. 55, 11. Jer. 2, 30. 8, 8 & 9. 1 Cor. 15, 10, 14 & 58. 2 Cor. 6, 1. Gal. 2, 2. Phil. 2, 16.

2. ἀλλὰ καὶ προπαθόντες—ἀγῶνι. Compare Acts 16, 22 seqq. Προπαθ. simply signifies “after having suffered,” &c. The verb is often used by Thucyd. and the best writers. The ὑβρισθέντες refers to his being scourged; which was an intolerable insult to a Roman citizen. See Benson. Ἐπαρρήσιάμεθα λαλῆσαι may be well rendered by our idiom, “took the liberty to speak; mustered up the courage to speak.” The term often carries with it a verb of speaking, either expressed (as Eph. 6, 20. and Acts 13, 46.), or understood; as in Acts 9, 27. At ἐν Θεῷ ἡμῶν some verb is omitted, and must be supplied. We may compare ἐπαρρ. ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ at Acts 14, 3.

2. ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι. The ἀγῶνι may either be rendered, with the early moderns, solicitous and painful care and study: as in Col. 2, 1., and the Sept. ;* or (with the antients, and, of the moderns, Grot., and almost all later Commentators) *peril, danger*; as in Phil. 1, 30. and Arrian Exp. Alex. 3, 15, 1. ὅτι ἐν ἀγῶνι ξυνέχεται τὸ κατὰ σφᾶς, καὶ βοηθεῖν δεῖ. And this latter sense seems more agreeable to the words following; though, indeed, both may be united.

3. ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν—δόλω. Παράκλησις must here (as Koppe observes) signify *teaching*, and comprehend the whole of the Apostle's religious instruction; as Acts 13, 15. 15, 31. See also Loesner's examples. The construction, he thinks, is Hebraic. But it seems rather *popular*. Οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης. The πλανή may denote either *imposture* and *seduction*; as Eph. 4, 14. 2 Thess. 2, 11. 1 Joh. 4, 6. 2 Pet. 3,

* To which may be added Thucyd. 2, 45. ὁρῶ μέγαν τὸν ἀγῶνα (where I shall adduce many more examples), and also Thucyd. 7, 71. ὁ δὲ πεζὸς—πολὺν τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ ξύστασιν τῆς γνώμης εἶχε, where many eminent Critics read from Plutarch ξύντασιν (i. e. *with agonizing intentness of mind*). And I would add that so Valla seems to have read. And this reading is supported by an imitation of Dio Cass. 367. Yet, strange to say, in another still plainer imitation at 575 & 576., he reads ξύστασιν, which is, moreover, defended by many other passages which I shall adduce in my note on that passage. I must therefore regard the common reading as the true one.

17.; or *error, self-deceit, enthusiasm*; as Rom. 1, 27. James 2, 18., and sometimes in the Sept. The *former* interpretation is here adopted by Benson, whom see; the *latter*, by Koppe, Mackn., Schleus., Rosenm., and most Commentators. Οὐτε ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, “nor from impure and corrupt motives, desire of wealth, honours, &c., nor founded in a desire of sensual gratification.” In this sense, as denoting *moral* impurity, the word is used in Rom. 6, 19. 1 Thess. 4, 8., and in the Sept. See Schleus. Lex., V. T., and Trommius. So also Arrian, cited by Koppe: ψυχῆς ἀκαθαρσία, δόγματα πονηρά. Benson takes it for *physical* impurity, i. e. *lewdness*. But in this I cannot assent to the learned Commentator.

3. οὐτε ἐν δόλῳ. “As their doctrine (says Benson) did not proceed from *imposture* or *impurity*, so neither did they preach it *in guile*. They used no craft or artifice in the preaching of it; did not artfully conceal some parts, and mix or adulterate others; did not assert the necessity of the Gentile Christians observing the law of Moses in order to please the Jews; did not model Christianity according to the old heathen religion, or contrive methods to make them easy in their vices, in order to draw in great numbers of the Gentiles.” See 1 Pet. 2, 1. and 3, 10. Δόλος, which has so much perplexed the Etymologists, seems to be derived from the Heb. פלל, *to draw out, make fine*; and thus literally signifies *finesse*.

4. ἀλλὰ καθὼς—λαλοῦμεν. This is exegetical of the preceding ἐν δόλῳ. The sense is: “We adulterate nothing (so Rosenm.); we preach nothing but what we have been divinely taught; we use no base arts, but only obey the Divine will.” Others think that καθὼς and οὕτω do not refer to the *mode* in which the Gospel was taught, but merely mean *sicut* and *sic*. The *construction* is rather unusual, and the Commentators say it is for ἐδοκιμάσε ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός, ὥστε πιστεῦν ἡμῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. There is, I think,

a blending of two clauses into one; q. d. “as we are approved by God, and put in trust with the Gospel.” Or we may supply οὕτω, corresponding to the elliptical οὕτω before πιστευθῆναι. In the *active*, indeed, δοκιμ. is far more usual, and in the sense *approve*, *choose*, &c. it occurs in Rom. 14, 22. and 1 Cor. 16, 3. Yet it does occur in the *passive* in this sense at 2 Macc. 4, 3, and Xen. Mem. 3, 5. cited by Schleus. The sense is clear from the preceding verse.

4. οὐκ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες, i. e. (as Pisc., Menoch., Koppe, and Rosenm. explain) “studying to please men.” But it rather seems to be put for ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι; as in Eph. 6, 6. The former expression, however, is used, for better adaptation to the antithesis ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ. I would compare Soph. Phil. 1445. and Ignat. ad Rom. C. 2. οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμῖν (I conjecture ὑμᾶς) ἀνθρωπαρεσκησαι, ἀλλὰ Θεῷ ἀρέσαι. *Why* this should be done is beautifully suggested by Soph. Antig. 74. as follows: ἐπεὶ πλείων χρόνος ὃν δεῖ μ’ ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κάτω, τῶν ἔνθαδε.

The ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰς καρδίας is a perpetual epithet of *God*, both in the Old and New Testament. Thus Acts 1, 24. 15, 6. and Rom. 8, 27., where see the notes. See an excellent Sermon on the above two verses by Dr. Maltby, vol. 2.

5, 6. On the sentiment contained in these verses, which are to be joined, compare 2 Cor. 2, 17. So Koppe, who (after Vatab.) says that οὐκ—ἐγενήθημεν is for οὐκ ἐκολακεύσαμεν; and he cites Classical examples of ἐν λόγῳ εἶναι and γενέσθαι for λέγειν, ἐν πράγματι εἶναι for πράττειν, ἐν παράβασει γινεσθαι for παρβαίνω, and such like. This savours of Hebraism; λόγῳ κολακείας being for κολακεία; as λόγος πορνείας at Matt. 5, 28. At least, ἐν is strongly expressive of *habit* and *plan* of life. Thus ἐν δόλῳ at ver. 4. Koppe well remarks that by this is denoted the *agendi ratio*. See Grot. As to Hammond’s interpretation, “to be talked of for flattery,” it is entirely refuted by Benson.

The ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας Loesner, Koppe, Rosenm., and Schleus., take for ἐν πλεονεξία, and adduce examples of the pleonasm from Philo. But to this summary way of wrapping up matters I can never give praise. *Philo* is a *pleonastic* writer; *St. Paul* is *not*: and the nature of pleonasms (as they are called) of this sort I have often before explained. They will usually be found to be two phrases blended into one. I therefore most approve of the version of Benson, “nor carried on any covetous design under a fair pretence.” See also Mackn. Πλεονεξ. perhaps does not so much signify avarice, or *covetousness*, as a greediness for self-gratification, including even that of glory and fame.* But, in order to make this the plainer, the Apostle adds, οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, “not seeking glory from men.” The participle is thought to be for the verb ἐζητήσαμεν. At least this is convenient, in order to hang thereon the particle δυνάμενοι; for the words οὔτε—ἄλλων are in some measure parenthetical.

6. δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι. On the meaning of ἐν βάρει Commentators, both antient and modern, have been divided in opinion. Thus Theophyl.: ἡ ἐν τιμῇ, καὶ δόξῃ, καὶ ὄγκῳ, ἡ δυνάμενοι λαμβάνειν καὶ τρέφεσθαι, καὶ βαρεῖς ὑμῖν εἶναι. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀξίωμα ἡμῶν τοῦτο ἀπαιτεῖ, λαμβάνει παρ’ ὑμῶν. The former interpretation, *to be in great dignity and authority*, is adopted by many modern Commentators; as Pisc., Zanch, Hamm., Vitringa, Benson, and others; and is also supported by the Syr. Version. This also is thought to best agree with what precedes. The common punctuation, too, by which these words are connected with the former, is favourable to it. But in other editions these words commence the 7th verse; and Koppe observes that that interpretation

* Thus Milton, in a fine passage of his exquisite *Lycidas*:

Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise,

(That last *infirmity* of noble minds,)

To scorn delights, and live laborious days.

See also *Paradise Regained*, L. III. sit. init. and the notes of Dr. Jortin.

is scarcely permitted by propriety of language: at least it cannot be *proved* from 2 Cor. 4, 17. Many eminent Interpreters, both antient and modern, as Beza, Grotius, Gomar, our English Translators, Doddr., Koppe, and Rosenm. (rightly, I think), prefer the *latter*; and it is ably defended by Wolf. Certainly it is more agreeable to the context. Compare ver. 9 & 11. and 2 Cor. 11, 9., where the Apostle says he preserved himself ἀβαρῆ. See also 2 Thess. 3, 7. 1 Tim. 5, 11. It is plain that ἐν βάρει εἶναι, is for βαρὺς εἶναι, ἐπιβαρεῖν.

Thus it would appear that the words οὔτε ζητοῦντες — ἄλλων are parenthetical; though it is not *necessary* to suppose so. After all it is not impossible that the Apostle has in view two significations of ἐν βάρει εἶναι to be burdensome by accepting a stipend, and to be, as we say, *hard upon* them, by assuming the full authority of an Apostle. So Dicæarchus, cited by Wets.: διὰ τὸ βάρος ἢ τὴν ὑπερηφάνειαν τῶν κατοικούντων and Hor. Ep. 2, 1, 13.*

7. ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν ἡπιοὶ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. The ἀλλὰ is thought, by Rosenm., to be pleonastic: but, I think, without reason. The sense is: "Yet (this we were not, but) were mild among you." The epithet is often, in the Classical writers, applied to *parents*, and therefore to *Kings*, as being figuratively *fathers*. (See Wetstein's examples.) This sort of *spiritual paternity* the Apostle alludes to in the words ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἐαυτῆς τέκνα: and this is sufficient to defend the common reading; though several antient MSS., some Versions, Fathers, and Commentators read νηπιοί, which is preferred by Calvin, and not disapproved of by Whitby. But that, as Benson observes, would require ὦ νηπιοί. Besides (I would add) the Apostle nowhere employs νηπίος in this sense. He would have *thus* written τέκνα. But it is needless to dilate on such a point;

* To which I add Joseph. p. 35. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔσεσθαι βαρὺς. Ach. Tat. 660. φορτικοὶ εἶναι & 302, 13. βαρὺς αὐτῷ γένοιτο. Xenoph. Hist. 3, 2, 1. ἐβουλεύετο—ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἐν τῇ φιλίᾳ χειμάζων, βαρὺς εἴη τοῖς συμμαχοῖς.

since the ν has plainly *adhered* from the preceding word, as in a thousand other cases.

The $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ is a Hebraism (derived from בתונכם) for $\epsilon\nu\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$, "among you." Τρόφος here denotes one who *suckles* a child, whether a *mother*, or, as we say, a *wet-nurse*. Thus it is sometimes in the Sept. and the Classical writers used for a *mother*. Θάλπω, whatever be its origin (for here all etymologists are in the dark; the word being, it seems, derived from some other language), certainly signifies, properly, to *warm*, *cherish*, as a hen who sits on her chickens. See Deut. 22, 6. and Job 39, 10. It is also used of the wife taken by David in his old age. See 1 Kings 1, 2 & 4. Schleus. also refers to Soph. Antig. 427. Hence it comes to denote any sort of care by which a mother provides for the nourishment and comfort of her children. See Eph. 5, 19. and the note.

The $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ is, in our common versions, rightly omitted; as is often the case with the personal pronouns, and ἰδίους . So that Benson and Mackn. have done wrong in expressing it, and making it emphatical.

8. οὕτως ἡμερόμενοι ὑμῶν, "thus being affectionately desirous of promoting your interest." It is strange that so many Critics should have preferred the reading ὁμερόμενοι, from several MSS., some early Editions, and Theophyl.: and that it should have been received into the text by both Griesbach and Matthæi. It is a word of no authority whatever, and formed contrary to all analogy. As to Theophylact's defence of it, it is too weak to bear examination. The principle on which the Critics have preferred it, namely, as being the more difficult, really will not apply to words, like the present, formed contrary to analogy, and destitute of authority; and especially if we can account for them from mere *error*; which is the case here; for the σ arose, doubtless, from the c preceding; and the $\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\iota\rho$. would easily pass into $\delta\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\iota\rho$., especially as $\delta\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\iota\rho$. or $\delta\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\rho$. was familiar; $\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\iota\rho$.

less so; and yet the latter word is used by the best writers, not only Poets, but also prose writers, as Herodot., Demosth., Ælian, Polyb., Plutarch, and others, cited by the Philological Commentators.

8. εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι—ψυχὰς, “we were ready and willing,” &c. Μεταδοῦναι, to *impart*, has properly the *genitive* and *dative*, but here, as elsewhere, the *accusative* and *dative*. The *accusative*, however, is used because no one can be supposed to give another part of his *life*. The truth is, there is (as Grot. observes) a *syllipsis*: for μεταδοῦναι is used of the Gospel *proprie*; of life *improprie*, or by metonymy. On the *sentiment*, which is inexpressibly affectionate, see Benson.

9. μνημονεύετε γὰρ—τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Compare 2 Thess. 3, 7—9. The μνημονεύετε is well rendered by Koppe *memineritis*. Benson renders it, “ye must remember.” Τὸν κόπον μου καὶ τον μόχθον. These words are nearly synonymous; though the latter is the stronger term; so that there is a kind of climax. The νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας is treated by most Commentators as put populariter, for *assidue*; and Koppe refers to 3, 10. But that passage is not to the purpose; nor does the idiom apply here. For I apprehend the Apostle here adverts to his excessive application to his handicraft labour, at some times almost toiling night and day, in order to allow himself opportunity, at other times, to pursue his evangelical labours. Or perhaps he may allude to his custom of making up for the loss of time by day at his trade, by *night labour*: and of this I have observed hints in the foregoing Epistles.

On ἐπιβαρῆσαι τινα compare ver. 7. and 2 Cor. 12, 16. Εἰς ὑμᾶς is for ὑμῖν.

10. ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες—ἐγενήθημεν. The words ὁσίως, δικαίως, and ἀμέμπτως, are treated by Koppe and Rosenm. as synonymes, but combined, to strengthen the sense. The ὁς., however, regards duty towards *God*; the δικ. that towards *men*; ἀμεμπτ. both; (though Theophyl. explains, ἀπροσκοπῶς, ἀσκανδα-

λίστεως.) Yet, I grant, *non argutandum est in verbis*.

11, 12. παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ παραμυθούμενοι. The participles παρακ. and παραμ. stand for verbs; or ἔσμεν is understood; or ἐγενήθημεν may be supplied (with Wolf) from the preceding verse. The terms παρακ., παραμ., and μαρτυρούμ. are said by Koppe and Rosenm. to be synonymous. But there seems rather to be a climax: certainly μαρτ. in this sense is stronger than either of the two former ones (so Theophyl.: πληκτικωτέρως διδασκαλίας ἐστίν), and signifies *obtestari*; as in Deut. 32, 16. So μαρτύρομαι, Eph. 4, 17. and Thucyd. 6, 80. and also Procop. 248, 40. μαρτύρεσαι γέτιγιν. And παραμ. seems to be a stronger term than παρακ. It is not well rendered *console*. The best modern critics observe, that the term may here have the same sense found sometimes in Homer (as Il. θ. 417 & 680. See Damm. Lex.). Xenoph. Venat. 6, 25. (to which may be added Appian 2, 892. μαρτύρομαι καὶ παρακαλῶ) by which it signifies to counsel, urge, *suadeo*.

At εἰς τὸ περιπατ. &c. compare Col. 1, 16., where see the note. The image at πατήρ corresponds to that at τροφός, ver. 7. Wets. compares Hom. Od. a. 308. In the ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν παρακαλοῦντες (with which I would compare Thucyd. 7, 69. τῶν τριηραχῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀνεκάλει) some recognise an allusion to the teaching from house to house. See Acts 2, 20. It simply signifies (I think) that he taught them individually as well as collectively. Βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν. A common hendiadis for βασιλείαν ἔνδοξον. See Benson.

13. ὅτι παραλαμβάνοντες—πιστεύουσιν. Παραλαμβάνω is a term often used of receiving instruction, either oral, or by letter. So Phil. 4, 9. ἃ ἐμάθετε καὶ παραλάβετε καὶ ἀκούσατε where see the note. In the words παραλαμβάνοντες—Θεοῦ there is a *trajectio*. The παραλαβ. λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, and λόγον ἀκοῆς are said to be for λόγον or ἀκοήν; as Hebr. 4, 2. I should regard this as a Hebraism (answering to רַבִּי) often

joined to pleonasms. There may be (as Morus thinks) an allusion to Is. 53, 1. *τις ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν.*

Ἐδέξασθε, *received, admitted, approved, embraced* it. So Theophyl. : *προσείχετε.* Rosenm. cites Herodot. 2. *ἐδέχοντο τοὺς λόγους.* I add Thucyd. 1, 95. *ἐδέξαντο τοὺς λόγους, καὶ πρόσκειχον τὴν γνώμην.* The earlier Commentators seem not to have perceived this sense of ἐδέξ., but to have confounded the term with παραλ.

13. ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται, “which is operative.” The ὃς is by some referred to Θεοῦ; by others to λόγου. The *latter* method is adopted by the most eminent modern Commentators. And so some antients, as Œcumen. αὖξει διὰ τοῦ ὑμετέρου βίου. And Theophyl. : ἐκ τῶν ἐργῶν δείκνυται, “has an operative influence on your hearts and lives, producing the fruits of good works.” Other antients, however, and moderns refer it to Θεοῦ. So Theodoret : *προφητικῆς γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ χάριτος ἀπολαύσαντες, καὶ προεφήτευσον, καὶ γλωσσαις ἠλάλουν, καὶ θαύματα ἐπετέλουν παράδοξα.* And if that construction be true, it must have reference to the *χαρίσματα*, also called *ἐνεργήματα*, 1 Cor. 12, 6. 10, 11. and Eph. 3, 20., such as were vouchsafed not only to the *Corinthians*, but to the Galatians and Ephesians, and also the Thessalonians. (1 Thess. 5, 19 & 20. and 1 Thess. 1, 5.) See Whitby, who, among other modern Commentators, adopts this interpretation. The *former* seems to deserve the preference : but perhaps the Apostle had in mind *both* the above senses.

14. ὑμεῖς γὰρ—X. 'I. Mackn. supposes the Apostle here introduces a reply to an objection against the truth of Christianity, founded in the disbelief of the Palestine Jews, and their bitter persecution of Christ and his disciples; which, he means to say, is reputed by their treatment of their own Prophets, of whom there was scarcely one that they had not at least persecuted. See Acts 7, 52. A very ingenious, but perhaps not well founded, and too hypothetical, a view ; at least there can only be a faint *allusion* in

the words following, τῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους προφήτας. Here the Apostle seems to intend an allusion to the proofs of divine ἐνέργημα upon them, namely, in enabling them to bear persecution and calamity. That such an ἐνέργημα of the holy spirit was thought necessary to produce that effect, we learn from various passages of the New Testament.

The plain sense, therefore, is : “ Such an ἐνέργημα ye had; for ye showed exemplary fortitude and patience,” &c. This, however, the Apostle expresses in a more refined way, by saying: “ ye were imitators of the Palestine church,” &c.; just as at 1, 6. “ ye were μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ” where see the note.

On the expression ἐκκλησιῶν—Χριστῶ I. see 1, 1. and the note. Such churches or congregations had been founded in various parts of Judæa by those who had fled from the persecution after the murder of Stephen. See Acts 8, 1—4. The Jews were every where the bitterest persecutors of Christians; and thus the Palestine ones suffered most from that baleful spirit. See Benson.

Συμφυλετῶν, literally, *fellow clansmen*, and in a general way *countrymen*.

15. καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους προφήτας. On the ἰδίους there has been some difference of opinion. Being omitted in a few Versions and Latin Fathers, it is regarded as spurious by many critics, and has been cancelled by Griesb.; but (I think) on insufficient grounds. One can hardly suppose that a marginal gloss should have crept into nearly all the MSS. It is far more probable that it was cancelled in a *few* copies, from a groundless fear lest it might countenance the heresy of Marcion, that the Jewish Prophets were not the Prophets of the true God; and as an excuse for the omission, they would be likely to plead a *corruption of the text*; and to cast that on *Marcion himself* would clench the argument. It is certain that the common reading, supported by *nearly* all the

MSS., the most antient Versions, and the unanimous consent of the Greek Fathers and Commentators, must be retained. It is ably defended by Whitby and Benson, and its emphasis must not, with Koppe, be *explained away* by taking it for *ἐαυτῶν*. When the Prophets of the Old Testament are so called, it must be observed they are called *according to the opinion of the people in question*: a figure often used by the best writers. And it is frivolous to object that these Jews did not themselves kill the Prophets of old. For (as Benson observes) they were actuated by the *same spirit*, and formed, as it were, the same people, and are so considered by our Lord, Matth. 23, 29—37. Nay, had the Prophets of old lived in their days, and so freely rebuked their vices, they would have slain *them* like their forefathers. Hence they are often charged with the murder of their own Prophets. See 1 Kings 19, 10 & 14. Neh. 9, 26. Jer. 2, 30. Luke 6, 23, 23, 33 & 34.

Ἐκδιωξάντων, i. e. literally, “chased away by persecution, or, in a general sense, *persecuted*.” Καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων. Some take ἀρεσκ. in the sense *seek to please*; as 2, 4. and Gal. 1, 10. It should rather seem to be said, by meiosis, for “are in disfavour with God.” So Koppe explains Θεοστυγείς. And so Theophyl. See also Wakef. on Eurip. Alc. 65. On the words καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων, which indicate that antipathy to all other nations (called by Tacitus the *adversus omnes alios hostile odium*), which raised “their hand against every man’s hand, and every man’s hand against theirs,” the Commentators adduce copious proofs and illustrations. It may be sufficient to note Diod. Sic. p. 5, 25. μόνους γὰρ ἀπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐπιμιξίας, καὶ πολεμίους ὑπολαμβάνειν πάντας. The passage of Juvenal Sat. 14, 103. will readily occur to my readers: “Non monstrare vias, eadem nisi sacra colenti; Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.” On the spirit by which the Jews were actuated towards the Christians see Benson.

16. κωλύόντων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσι λαλῆσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν. The κωλ. is rightly rendered by Benson and Mackn. *hindering*. So Theophyl. : ἐμποδιζόντων. It, however, includes *forbidding*. At λαλῆσαι the Commentators understood τὸν λόγον, *the Gospel*. But the unbelieving Jews could not approve of the Gospel being preached to the *Jews*. Therefore by λαλῆσαι I would understand instruction in religion *generally*, by withdrawing them from Heathenism.

16. ἵνα σωθῶσιν. The Commentators rightly remark that the ἵνα is *eventual*, like the Hebr. לְ, or לְמַדְּ, “in order to their being saved.” “Thus (says Theophyl.) they are the common enemies of the human race, by hindering the common salvation.”

16. εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντοτε. This is rendered by Benson and Mackn., “whereby they are filling,” &c. A sense, however, scarcely permitted by the force of the εἰς τὸ, which is well explained by Phot. ap. Œcumen. : ἵνα πάντοτε ἀναπληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι αὐτῶν adding, ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πάντοτε ταῦτα ἔπραττον πάντοτε ἀνεπλήρουν τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. And Theophyl. : ἵνα δεικνύωσιν ἑαυτοὺς τὰ τελειότατα ἀμαρτάνοντας, καὶ φθάνοντας τὸ πλήρες μέτρον τῆς κακίας καὶ ἀκρότατον. So Doddr. “as if they desired to fill up,” &c. And so Koppe, who renders : “ita fit, ut peccatorum suorum vim semper magis magisque augeant, eorumque pœnas eo atrociores sibi contrahant.” He adds that this is agreeable to the Scriptural opinion concerning sins and their punishment, namely, that God indeed permits men to fill up a certain number of evil deeds, and until then spares them and delays the punishment ; but if this number should be completed, then the punishment is inevitable. See Gen. 15, 16. Ἀναπληρῶσαι τ. α. signifies to *fill up the measure*, &c. as Matth. 23, 32. In this, Benson thinks, there is an allusion to filling up a vessel to the brim. (See his note.) Πάντοτε is not well rendered *semper*. It signifies *omni modo*, Angl. *every way*.

16. ἔφθασε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος. At ἡ ὀργὴ must be supplied τοῦ Θεοῦ, which seems implied by the article. It is observed, too, by Theoph., that the article shows this ὀργήν, to be ὀφειλομένην αὐτοῖς, καὶ προωρισμένην, καὶ προφητευομένην due to them, predestined, and predicted by the Prophets." Here ὀργὴ is to be taken in the sense of *punishment*; as supra 1, 10. where see the note. Ἐφθασε is by some, (as Koppe) taken in a *future* sense. But I prefer to regard it (with Benson) as a Paulo-post future: and we may suppose that, as being an aorist, it is taken in a sense between the preterite and present; q. d. "is, in a manner, coming upon them." For it came upon them in the destruction of the nation and the dispersion of the remnant a very short time (about twenty years) afterwards. Of this idiom the Commentators adduce as examples Eccles. 8, 4. Dem. 7, 22. Matt. 12, 28. and Rom. 9, 31.

Εἰς τέλος may mean either *at the last, at length*, (as it is interpreted by some early moderns, as Benson, Mackn., Rosenm., Koppe, and Wets., which last mentioned Commentator compares Hom. Il. λ. 451. φθῇ σε τέλος θανάτοιο κιχήμενον οὐδ' ὑπάλυσας. and so most recent ones); or, "for an end, and to the uttermost." So the antients, who explain ἄχρι τέλους, and many eminent moderns, as our English translators, Doddr., Schmidt, and Homberg; and this is a far more significant and apposite sense. (See Dodd. and Wets. ap. Slade.) The Commentators compare the Hebr. כִּי כִּנְיָ, and refer to Dan. 9, 27. Num. 17, 13. and Joseph. 8, 24. 10, 20. They might (I think) have also compared the expression *make a full end* in Jer. 4, 27. 5, 10. and Ez. 11, 13. To urge that the destruction was not *utter*, because a few escaped, is frivolous.

17. ἡμεῖς δὲ—καιρὸν ὄρας. The Apostle now returns to the Thessalonians, from whom, by these rather vehement strictures on the Jews, their present iniquity and future ruin, he had made a digression:

and he freely expresses his desire of again seeing them. (Heinr.)

17. ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν, “separated and kept apart from you.” This word is somewhat rare; but it occurs in Æschyl. Choeph. 244., and also in the passive, as here. Abresch on that passage adduces two examples of the simple in a metaphorical sense, one from Hyllus ap. Joph. in Trach. 958., and the other from Pind. Pyth. 4, 504. The term is used properly of the separation of children from parents; but also of that of parents from children; as here. (So Hesych.) For Christian teachers were regarded as spiritual fathers. We have a continuation of the metaphor at ver. 7 & 11. See Theodor.

Πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας is taken by the best Commentators (as Grot.) for πρὸς καιρὸν; as in 2 Cor. 7, 8. Gal. 2, 5. Philem. 15.; or πρὸς ὥραν, in Luke 8, 13. and 1. Cor. 7, 5. So Gen. 18, 10. כִּי תֵעָב, where the Sept. renders κατὰ καιρὸν εἰς ὥρας. And so the the Latin *horæ momento*. It should rather that these *double expressions* both in Hebr. Greek, and Latin, are properly intended to convey more meaning than either of the phrases singly. So Theophyl.: πρὸς καιρὸν βραχὺν καὶ ὀλίγον, καὶ ὅσον ὥρας μιᾶς λογίζεσθαι. And though it was several years before the Apostle *did* revisit them, yet he seems here to have *intended* a much more speedy return to them (whether *so soon* as some suppose, may be thought very doubtful); not to say, as (Doddr. observes) that “his mind was so full of the ideas of eternal life as to annihilate every period of mortal life.”

The expression προσώπω, οὐ καρδίᾳ, is very elegant, and indeed touching. And it is impossible to conceive any stronger than the following, περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ; for these are to be conjoined; ἐν ἐπιθ. being a phrase for an adverb. Ἐσπουδάσαμεν, *strove*; as Eph. 4, 5. 2 Tim. 2, 15., and elsewhere. Περισσοτέρως, *exceedingly*. A word often used by the Apostle, as also other words beginning with περὶ and ὑπέρ. (See Grot.) Τὸ πρόσωπον

ὕμῶν ἰδεῖν. A Hebraism for, “be present with you;” as 1 Cor. 16, 7. The force of the phraseology is well illustrated by Theophyl. and Benson.

18. Διὸ ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. The διὸ is rendered by Benson, “therefore it is evident that.” It rather seems to signify “impelled by this desire,” and may be well rendered *wherefore*. Ἠθελήσαμεν, i. e. “we were desirous; our mind was set upon coming.” Ἐγὼ μὲν Παυλὸς, “I Paul indeed, at least, or in particular.” Koppe observes, that this interpretation of the plural number, which St. Paul every where uses in the present Epistle, though speaking of himself, is to be noted and borne in mind. See the note on 1, 2. On ἅπαξ καὶ δις, see the note on Phil. 4, 16. I would compare Appian 2, 80, 30. καὶ τοῦτο δις καὶ τρις ἑτέροις καὶ ἑτέροις πρέσβεσιν εἰπὼν. Καὶ, γ, but Ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς, “thwarted our purpose.” See the note on Gal. 5, 7. This is imputed to *Satan*, as having been done by *wicked persons*, and it was to be presumed, at his suggestion, and with his assistance, or that of his subordinate agents (see 1 Cor. 7, 5. Eph. 2, 2. and Ap. 20, 3, 7 & 8.); just as whatever is *good* is attributed to the influence of the *holy spirit*. So Koppe; though he and most recent foreign Commentators push the matter much farther, and run into foolish, not to say irreverent, speculations on this subject.

19. τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς—παρουσία; The connection, (which is not well traced by the Commentators) seems to be this: “And it is no wonder that we should thus feel desirous of seeing you; *for*, what is our hope,” &c. After γὰρ, it would have been plainer to have written, “ye are our hope.” But the interrogation, with the answer to it, is used instead, by an elegance not unworthy of Demosthenes himself. The construction, too, of the words is somewhat embarrassed *per trajectionem*; and it is thus adjusted by Koppe and Rosenm.: τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς, ἢ χαρὰ, ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Κυρίου ἐμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς; Ἐλπὶς

and χαρὰ are put, by metonymy, for “cause of hope and joy.” This use of ἐλπίς, and the Latin *spes*, is common in the Classical writers, from whom Wets. adduces several examples. Koppe regards the ἐλπίς, χαρὰ, and καυχ. as nearly synonymous, and all used to denote *felicity*. But the terms will bear discrimination; and there seems to be a climax. On the ἐλπίς ἐστε compare Col. 1, 27. and 1 Tim. 1, 1. By καυχ. is meant joy of the highest sort, accompanied with self-congratulation, &c. When united with στέφανος (on which I would compare Soph. Aj. 465. στέφανον εὐκλείας,) it forms a *phrasis prægnans*, in which two phrases are united: “ye are our (cause of) reward, and (cause of) exultation’.” So Theophyl. The καὶ in καὶ ὑμεῖς, imports (as Theophyl. Grot., Pisc., Erasm., Est., Koppe, and Rosenm. observe) ye *also*, i. e. “ye also, as well as some other congregations.” Others take it to signify *even*, which sense Benson strenuously, but not (I think) successfully, supports.

The remaining words denote the advent of Christ to judgment.

20. ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά. Γὰρ is not merely a particle of transition, as Koppe supposes. Crell. rightly remarks that it expresses the force of the preceding interrogation, and so repeats the same sentence, with asseveration; q. d. “I may well say so; *for* ye surely are,” &c. So Tindale: “yea, ye are our glory and joy.” Benson renders it *certainly*; and he compares a similar use of the Hebr. וְ. He observes too, that the present is put for the future; and well paraphrases thus: “ye are the persons that will be,” &c. Compare Dan. 12, 3. 1 Cor. 1, 14. Phil. 2, 6. 4, 6. Thess. 3, 13. Benson and Mackn. infer from hence (somewhat precariously) that the words imply a personal knowledge of his converts at the last day, and therefore establish the doctrine that we shall know our friends in another state.

CHAP. III.

1. Διὸ μηκέτι στέγοντες εὐδοκήσαμεν—μόνοι. The sense of the verse is somewhat obscure, from brevity, and the idiomatical use of στέγοντος and εὐδοκήσαμεν. It is of importance to attend to the διὸ, which has (I think) the same force as at 2, 18. For (though the Commentators do not notice it) the Apostle means to give them another proof of his affection. Στέγοντες is regarded by most moderns as a reciprocal in the hithpahal sense *refrain*. Others supply from the context τὸν πόθον ὑμῶν; which method yields the same sense, but is somewhat too arbitrary. I prefer the former. The Etym. Mag. explains στέγω by ὑπομένω. Something, however, seems wanting to the sense; and Grot. supplies after μόνοι, “triste hoc, sed tamen hoc libenter feceramus, et ego et Silas vestri caussâ.” But this seems too arbitrary a subaudition, I prefer taking εὐδ., with Theophyl. and Œcumen., in a double sense, as a *vox prægnans*, “we thought good, and endured.” I would paraphrase: “Wherefore so dear were ye to me, that when I could refrain no longer, and yet found it impossible for me to visit you, I thought good, and endured being left alone at Athens.” The subaudition “and yet found it impossible,” &c. is indeed harsh, but it is adopted by Theodoret.

By the μόνοι, it is plain, the Apostle means himself only; as appears from ver. 5. See 2, 5 & 18. On St. Paul's disagreeable situation on this occasion see Benson.

2. καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν T.—Χριστοῦ, “our brother minister, or colleague.” See Col. 1, 1. and the note. This is *not* (as Hein. and Rosenm. regard it) a mere term of affection. Διάκονον τοῦ Θεοῦ. A general term denoting all teachers of religion, nay, even Apostles themselves. See 1 Cor. 3, 5. By all these

terms the Apostle means to hint that he had supplied his absence by an able substitute.

2. εἰς τὸ στήριξαι—πίστεως ὑμῶν, “in order to confirm you,” &c. It is matter of debate among Commentators what sense ought to be assigned to παρακαλέσαι. Some, following the common signification of the word, render it *exhort*. But this seems not a little harsh. Others, *console and comfort*. But the most natural sense, and that most agreeable to the περὶ τῆς πίστεως, is the one assigned by some moderns, namely, *teach, instruct*; as in 2, 3. and Acts 15, 20. where παρακαλεῖν and στήριζειν are likewise joined. It may, however, signify both *teach* and *admonish*; since the senses are cognate. The Thessalonians had, it seems, been wavering for want of instruction and admonition.

3. τῷ μηδένα—ταύταις. This and the next verse are explanatory of the στήριξαι. At τῷ I would sub- and ἐπί. Many MSS. read τὸ; others, τοῦ. But these are evidently ex emendatione, though more elegant. The common reading, as being the more difficult and agreeable to the Hellenistical use (for so the Hebr. מִי), ought to be retained. Τῷ is for εἰς τὸ. The word σαίνω from σάω, cognate with σέω and σείω (of which examples are somewhat rare in the Classical writers, though some are adduced by Wets.), signifies to *move, stir, wag*. And σαίνεσθαι signifies, “to be swayed, and swerve from the faith, to be troubled. So Hesych.: σαίνει, κινεῖται, σαλεύεται, ταράσσεται. And Chrys.; θορυβεῖσθαι. Both these significations may here be conjoined; for both are equally supported by the Classical citations of Wets. and others.

3. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα. The best Commentators are agreed that κείμεθα signifies *we are appointed, destined*: and they compare Luke 2, 34. and Phil. 1, 7., which latter passage is *most* to the purpose. But I cannot think (with Koppe and Rosenm.) that this is a common phrase importing, “Such is our fortune and fate.” Nor would I

press on the sense of *destination*. As *κεῖμαι* properly signifies *to be placed*, there may possibly be a *military* allusion; q. d. “we are appointed to bear, as a soldier is appointed to maintain a certain post.” I would here compare Job 5, 7. and 2 Tim. 3, 12. The Commentators are not agreed whether the words are to be referred to the *Apostles*, or extended to the *Thessalonians*, or to *all Christians*. (See Benson.) It should seem that they are here meant only for the Apostles and Thessalonians; but they are applicable to all Christians, according to the circumstances of the Gospel.

4. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς—οἶδατε, “(Nor need I now say it) *for* when we were with you.” Πρὸς, *apud*, *ἐν*, *chez*; as Matt. 26, 55. Mark 9, 19. Joh. 1, 1. Rom. 5, 1. and often. (See Schleus. Lex.) Προελέγομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι. By the *we* is here again meant himself and the Thessalonians. Καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο, καὶ οἶδατε is a somewhat harsh phrase for, “which also, as ye know, came to pass.” The Apostle evidently adverts to a prediction of evils which assuredly came to pass. The conclusion is obvious, on which see Benson and Mackn. On the circumstances alluded to see Acts 17, 5—10.

5. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ, μηκέτι στέγων, &c. Here we have a resumption of what was said at ver. 1. & 2.; ver. 3 & 4 being parenthetical. The Apostle, out of his great anxiety for their spiritual good, sent to know their state,* and to impart the necessary admonitions, confirmation, and consolation. Μήπως ἐπέειπεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων. Here there is the usual ellipsis of φοβούμενος; “lest the tempter,” &c. Ὁ

* It is well observed by Benson that “the Apostle knew all things respecting Christ’s doctrine, but was not inspired with a knowledge of all other things.” I would add, not a *perpetual knowledge*, but only imparted suddenly, as occasion served, like the power of working miracles. So Theophyl. οὐ πάντα ᾔδεσαν οἱ ἄγιοι οὐδὲ ἀπῆλανον τῆς θείας ἀεὶ βοηθείας. The mind of man (even of St. Paul) could hardly have borne the possession of a complete knowledge of all things, and an unlimited controul over the order of nature. Theophyl. says this power was withheld ἵνα μήτ’ αὐτοὶ ἐπαίρωνται, &c.

πειράζων. This participle, or verbal (which answers to the Heb. *המנסה*) is a common appellation of *Satan*. See Schleus. or Wahl. The best modern Commentators (after Grot.) take the *ἐπείρασεν* to signify, *tempt with effect, successfully tempt*; citing Gal. 6, 1. James 1, 13, &c. See Schleus. And, indeed, there are many verbs that thus denote *cum actione effectum quoque*, as Grot. says. “The temptation (Benson observes) was a love of ease, a fear of persecution, or some other worldly views.” On the extent of this diabolical influence much *might* be said; sed *ἐπέχω*. See the note supra 2, 18.

5. καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν. So the Heb. *לריק*. It is only necessary to remark that this, compared with 1, 4., proves that they were not, as individuals, absolutely and unconditionally elected to eternal life. See the note of Whitby, and especially Benson.

6. ἄρτι δὲ ἐλθόντες Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ’ ὑμῶν. The *ἄρτι* signifies *now*, or *then*, and is emphatic. Ἐλθ., “after Timothy had returned to us from you, and had brought us the good tidings of your (steadfastness in the) faith and of your love, and that ye have evermore a grateful and kind remembrance of us, and are as desirous to see us as we to see you.” *Εὐαγγελίζω* is here used in its primitive sense, *bring good news*; as in Luke 1, 19. So the Heb. *בשר*. (See Gesen. Lex. Hebr.)

These virtues, *faith* and *charity*, Grot. calls the *egregiam et salutiferam ξυνωρίδα*.

7. διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, “Upon this, because of this,” &c. Grot. and Rosenm. remark on the *trajectio* here; the true construction being as follows: Ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν παρεκλήθημεν ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως. The ἐφ’ ὑμῶν, Koppe and Rosenm. say, is redundant. But that is not exactly the case. Considering, too, the separation of *παρεκλήθημεν* and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, it is very useful to the sense. Ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν, “amidst all our afflictions and necessi-

ties." On these terms the Interpreters do not satisfactorily treat. The best commentary on them is 2 Cor. 6, 4. ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀναγκαῖς, where see the note. See also 12, 10. & 11, 27. It signifies pinching want of the common conveniences of life. Theophyl. here elegantly paraphrases : ἡ γὰρ ἐφ' ὑμῖν χάρα ἀντίρροπος πάσαις ταῖς ἀνάγκαις ἐγένετο.

8. ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκετε ἐ. K. " (We may well say that we were and are comforted in our distress) for *now* (that we have this good news) we do indeed live," i. e. enjoy life. This sense of ζῆν and *vivere* in the Latin is common. The words of Martial will readily occur to my readers : " Non est vivere sed valere vita." And so Menand. (cited by Wets.) μικρὸν τι τοῦ βίου καὶ στενὸν ζῶμεν χρόνον. See more in Wets. Στήκετε ἐ. K., " stand fast, are steadfast in the faith." Compare Gal. 5, 1. and Phil. 4, 1., where see the notes.

9. τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ—ἡμῶν. By τίνα εὐχαριστίαν is meant τίνα εὐχαριστίαν ἀξίαν, " what sufficient thanks, how can we be thankful enough to God." So Theophyl. : Τοσαύτη ἡ δι' ὑμᾶς χαρὰ, ὅτι οὐδὲ εὐχαριστήσαι τῷ Θεῷ κατ' ἀξίαν δυνάμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. See Ps. 116, 12. The words ἐπὶ πάσῃ, &c., are exegetical of the περὶ ὑμῶν, and signify : " on account of the joy we felt for your sakes." The πάσῃ here, and at ver. 7., signifies what is *great*. In χαρᾷ ἢ χαίρομεν there is a usual Hebraism and Hellenism ; though it here, as often, has an intensive force. Ἐλπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The best modern Commentators unite this phrase with χαρᾷ, and render it, *sincere, pious*. But this is very frigid ; and, considering that the word comes last in the sentence, something more is requisite. I cannot but think that Chrysost., Theophyl., and Œcumen., are right in considering the phrase as meant to refer to *God* as the *Author* of that joy ; and to hint that it is his *gift*, and not to be ascribed to their own exertions alone.

10. νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὑπὲρ ἐκπερισσοῦ δεόμενοι. I

would observe that the Apostle, in adverting to the effects which the good news of their stedfastness had upon him, first mentions his devout thankfulness to God as the Author, and then his exceeding and perpetual desire of seeing them, and repairing what was wanting in their faith. On the *νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας* I have treated *supra* 2, 9. and Eph. 3, 20. *Δεόμενοι* is considered as a participle for a finite verb. Or it may be a *nominativus pendens*. After it must be understood *τὸν Θεόν*; as Rom. 1, 8. *Εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν* is put (somewhat harshly) for *ὥστε ἰδεῖν*. The Apostle does not merely dwell on his *self-gratification*, but adverts to the *use* to which he would make this his visit subservient, namely, *καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν*, where, Koppe and Rosenm. observe, *καταρτ.* is for *προσαναπληροῦν* at 2 Cor. 9, 12. and Col. 1, 24. And, indeed, the passages may very well be compared as similar: but it is more correct to say, that the Apostle here blends (or confounds) two separate phrases with different metaphors, i. e. 1st, to repair the breaches in their faith; a metaphor taken from making garments or nets; 2dly, to supply what is wanting. Yet there is a close connection between them. Thus at Gal. 6, 1. *καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον*. Theodoret explains *διορθοῦσθε—τὸ ἐλλεῖπον ἀναπληροῦτε*. Now this *κατάρτισις* would be effected not so much by imparting (as some think) a knowledge of truths of which they were ignorant, as by removing doubts, and rectifying various misapprehensions of Christian truths, which are far more common, even in the most enlightened congregations, than can easily be supposed.

11. *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμᾶς*, “Now (Lat. *autem*) may God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.”* An elegant way

* The Commentators have not sufficiently seen that in *κατευθύναι* there is something more to be attended to than *taking a straight course*. There seems an allusion to making a straight road (for with the antients all great roads were carried in a straight direction); which implied a removal of the obstacles by levelling the

of saying: "May God cause us to come unto you;" this being a sort of prayer to the Father and the Son. Thus we have here an example of prayer addressed to Christ; as at 2 Thess. 2, 16 & 17. and 3, 5, &c. On which subject Benson has a long annotation. He contends that the prayers are addressed to Christ as Mediator. But this I apprehend to be a mistaken view, and a most unwarrantable refinement. I assent to the opinion of those who maintain (as Whitby) that prayer offered up by all Christians, in all places, implies omniscience, omnipresence, and a searching of all hearts in the Being so addressed; and therefore as this implies Deity, the prayers must be offered up to him in *that* capacity; since *then* it were frivolous to address him as *Mediator*.

12. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι—εἰς ὑμᾶς. We have here only to observe that *πλεονάσαι* and *περισσ.* are used in an active sense; words of this kind, both in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, being used indifferently, either as neuter, or active. So also our verb *increase*. See 2 Cor. 9, 8. By *πάντας* the recent Commentators would understand all other congregations of Christians whom the Thessalonians, from their riches, should assist. But there is no reason to think that the Thessalonian Christians *were rich*; and the sense is very forced and frigid. I see not why we should abandon the interpretation of the antients and most moderns, who understand *all men*, whether Christians or not. And this is placed beyond a doubt by the use of the same phrase at 5, 15. And so Gal. 6, 10. ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως, where see the note. With the *κάθαπερ ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς* (where must be understood *ἀγάπη πλεονάζομεν καὶ*

eminences, and raising the hollows (see Matt. 3, 3. Mark 1, 3. Luke 3, 4. Joh. 1, 23. and the notes), to the former of which the *κατὰ* chiefly refers. Here there is an allusion to the removal of those obstacles which had been raised by evil beings of every kind, both the author of evil and his subordinate agents, whether Demoniacal or human.

περισσεύομεν), which refers to the εἰς ἀλλήλους, we may compare the καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς supra 6, 13.

12. εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι—πατρὸς ἡμῶν. The εἰς τὸ στ. is taken by Koppe for στηρίξαι, but this is not necessary. It is rather for ὥστε στηρίξαι, by a Hebraism. In the construction there is something awkward, by the interposition of ἀμέμπτως, which does not well amalgamate with the preceding and following words. Grot. would take it for ἵνα ᾗτε ἀμέμπτοι. Compare seqq. Eph. 5, 27. and 2 Cor. 11, 2. And Koppe and Rosenm. would unite ἀμέμπτως with ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (See their notes.) In all this, however, there seems to be something too artificial. It seems better to regard the whole sentence as consisting of two separate ones blended into one; consequently some little sacrifice of grammatical or logical regularity must be expected.

On the sense of τῶν ἀγίων Commentators are not agreed. Some antients (as appears from the gloss in several MSS., ἀγγέλων) and some eminent moderns, as Grot., Wolf, Koppe, and Rosenm., interpret it, *the angels*, according to the usual description of the day of judgment. See Matt. 16, 27. 25, 31. Dan. 7, 10. Mark 8, 38. 2 Thess. 1, 7. By most antients, including the Vulg., and, of the moderns, our English Translators, Beza, and Benson, it is taken to denote all *faithful Christians*; as 2 Thess. 1, 10. Philem. 5. Perhaps both may be meant. On the *sentiment* see Benson and Mackn.

CHAP. IV.

VERSE 1. τὸ λοιπὸν. A formula, Grot. observes, *properantis ad finem*; as at 2 Cor. 13, 11. Gal. 6, 17. Eph. 6, 10. Phil. 4, 8. Ἐρωτῶμεν, “we entreat you.” On this term I have before treated. It occurs in Acts 3, 3. Joh. 14, 16., and often elsewhere, (See Schleus. or Wahl.) The καθὼς requires an οὕτως to be supplied at περισσ. Περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ may be a sort of heudiadis, or be taken (with

Koppe) for περιπατεῖν ὥστε ἀρέσκειν; as περιπατεῖν ἀξίως Θεοῦ at 2, 12. Περισσεύειν is here put for ζητεῖν περισσεύειν, by a common idiom in many verbs. The term signifies to *increase, make proficiency*.

2. οἶδατε—Ἰησοῦ. The παραγγελία signifies an authoritative injunction, from a king, or (as here) a divinely commissioned legate. For διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ signifies (as Koppe says) “*ex auctoritate Jesu.*”

3. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν. The Apostle now produces one παραγγελία, and that in the most solemn and impressive manner. “*This is the will of God (which you are hereby called upon to obey).*” Ἀγιασμός denotes in general holiness, purity, and innocence of life, like ἁγιωσύνη 3, 13. Rom. 6, 19 & 22. But it was especially used of the cultivation of purity in respect to sensual indulgences; and to this the Apostle here immediately applies it. Ἀπέχεσθαι depends upon ὥστε.

4, 5, 6, 7, 8. The Apostle especially details examples of this branch of the ἁγιασμός, and first adduces πορνεία, which must here (as in many other places) signify lewdness of every kind, both fornication, adultery, and all those impurities with which the Apostle charges the Gentiles, Rom. 1. So Theophyl.: Πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ εἶδη ταύτης καὶ πολύπλοκα, ἃ οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν ἡνέσχετο, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς, πάσης, εἶπεν. The reading πάσης, found in some MSS. and the Syr., and also Chrys. and the Greek Commentators, seems to have come from the margin; though it shows the extent of signification which the ancients affixed to the word.

4. εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν—τιμῇ. It is strange that there should have been such difference of opinion on the sense of σκεῦος; some interpret it of the *wife*, as Augustin, T. Aquinas, Est., Pisc., Heins., Wets., Schoettg., Koppe, and others. It is strange that this interpretation should have been maintained by any of the more recent Commentators, since it had been long ago completely refuted by Salmasius. (See Wolf.) It is plain that the Apostle’s injunctions are meant for *all Christians*, whether married or unmarried. So Theodoret: οὐ γὰρ τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι μόνοις τὴν νομοθεσίαν προσφέρει. And the passage of 1 Pet. 3, 7. is not applicable; because *there* σκεῦος has the

epithet ἀσθενέστερον annexed : and, therefore, though Schoettg. has proved that the Rabbins call the wife כלי, yet that will not here apply ; since the Apostle intends no such limitation. Still less defensible is the interpretation of J. H. Maius, Schomer, Triller, Wokens, and other Dutch * Theologians ap. Wolf, who, with the characteristic grossness of their nation, adopt such an one as decorum will not permit me to state, and which is the less excusable, as they cannot find a single example at all similar in the writings of the Apostle. The only interpretation that will bear examination is that of Chrys., Tertulian, and the Greek Commentators, and most modern ones, including Benson, Rosenm., and Schleus., namely, “his own *body*,” by a use similar to that of σκῆνος among the Greek Philosophers. And so *vas* is used in Cicero, and in Lucret. 3, 441. See Cor. 4, 7. and the note. And it is observed by Benson, that Barnabas (Ep. § 7, 11.) calls our Lord’s body *the vessel of his spirit* ; and § 21. he calls the human body *the beautiful vessel of the body* ; and Hermes, L. 1, 5, 1 and 2. calls the body *the vessel*, without the addition of any other word to explain it.

Κτᾶσθαι signifies to *use, preserve* ; as Luke 21, 19. κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.† See Loesner’s examples. As to Wetstein’s objections to this use of κτισ. they seem very frivolous. In εἰδέναι κτᾶσθαι there is an elegance unperceived by the Commentators, who explain : “mind that ye possess,” referring to 5,

* I am concerned to have to add the name of one of the most learned Theologians *our own* nation ever produced, that prodigy of erudition Gataker, who has here defiled his page by such abominable language, and gross illustrations as would suit better for a note on Petron. Arbiter, or the Carmina Priapeia, than the word of God. On this Pole with unusual smartness remarks : “Si hic sit loci sensus, vide et imitare insignem styli Scripturæ S. puritatem.” But this is *decency*, compared with the truly *beastly* citations from two Rabbinical writers adduced by Wets. on the next verse.

† It is ingeniously remarked by Theophyl. : ὅταν μὲν οὖν σωφρονῶμεν, καὶ ἡ καθαρὸν, ἡμεῖς αὐτὸ κτῶμεθα ὅταν δὲ ἀκάθαρτον ἡ, ἡ ἁμαρτία αὐτὸ κτᾶται ἡ γὰρ ἐκείνη ἐπιτάττει, ποιεῖ αὐτὸ ὡς δοῦλον.

12. and 1 Cor. 16, 15. There is (I repeat) a delicacy; for he who abuses his body to lewdness may, by a *meiosis*, be said not to *know how to use it*. Ἐντιμῇ, “in purity.” Said in opposition to ἀτιμία, a term especially applied to lust, as being a *dishonouring* of the body. So Rom. 1, 26. πάθει ἀτιμίας.

The words μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας are added *per exegesis*. Both terms (especially the former) are (as Koppe remarks) used of lasciviousness. See Gal. 5, 20. Grot. has here some learned and curious remarks on the peculiar use of the words πάθος, ἐπιθυμία, &c. by the Greek Philosophers (the substance of which may be seen in Benson): but almost all these are strangely out of place; for the sense of the words being determined by the context, and the subject matter, they can have no other than that above detailed.

By the ἔθνη Commentators understand the *Greeks* and *Romans*: and here Whitby and Benson enter into particulars, which (as Doddr. says) are not to be read without a mixture of commiseration and horror. Yet the Apostle may be supposed also to have reference to the Persians and other Oriental nations, from whom, there is doubt, the abominations adverted to were derived, mediately or immediately. Greece, for instance, was first defiled by Persia and Egypt, which latter nation (from the climate, dense population, and absorption in manufacturing and commercial pursuits) was in all ages a sink of impurity.

On the virtue of chastity see the sensible remarks of Benson.

6. τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. On the sense of these words Commentators are as little agreed as on the preceding; nay, they differ more widely. Almost all the Greek Fathers and Commentators, and, of the Latin ones, Jerome and Hilary, and many moderns, as Menoch, Est., De Dieu, Hamm., Zeger, Raphel, Heins., Wets., Whitby, Mackn., Wells, Rosenm., Slade, and many others mentioned in Wolf, refer them to

adultery; which was formerly my own opinion. And certainly this is much countenanced by the *context* from ver. 4.; for to that ἀκαθ' and ἀγιασμός seem especially referable. But when we turn to the *phraseology*, there appears little to countenance the interpretation. The proof as regards ὑπερβαίνειν and πλεονεκτεῖν is singularly weak,* and, at any rate, would only denote what we call *seduction*. But then the Apostle uses the masculine ἀδελφόν. Though Mackn., forgetful at once of good sense and decorum, renders: "that no man should go beyond the bounds of chastity; or defraud his brother in this matter, by defiling either him, or his relations, whether *male* or *female*." The interpretation in question moreover requires τῷ πράγματι to be taken in sensu nequiori; a signification quite unauthorized by the usage of Scripture (for the passage of 2 Cor. 7, 11. is, as Wolf and Koppe observe, not at all in point), however it may be found in the *Classical* writers (as Æschin., C. Timarch., and Isæus, cited by Wets.), like that of *facinus* in the Latin. That Bp. Middleton should have adopted an interpretation so unauthorized, and little agreeable to the whole manner of the Apostle is amazing; and strange indeed it is that Mr. Slade's good sense should have been so dormant as to suffer him to suppose that the Apostle may allude to making a gain by libidinous practices; even more absurd this than his similar perversion of Ephes. 4, 19. where see the note. Doddr., with an ἀκρισία unusual to him (and which I can only account for from extreme inadvertence) would unite both senses.

I must therefore acquiesce in the interpretation of most of the Latin and many eminent modern Commentators, as Beza, Zanch, Gomar, Pisc., Vorst., Grot., Michaelis, Schoettg., Wolf, Doddr., Koppe,

* And, as Koppe remarks, the uses of the phrases ὑπερβαίνειν λεκτρὸν and ἐπιβαίνειν, &c. are not here applicable. He does not say *why*. The reason is, that the former is purely poetical, and the latter is too gross to be thought of.

and Schleus., who here suppose a separate admonition respecting a vice which, in so commercial a city as Thessalonica was no doubt very prevalent, namely, *extortion* and an over-reaching, grasping, and greedy disposition.* Ἀδελφὸν does not mean *brother Christian* (on which seense some have founded an objection to this interpretation), but *fellow-creature*, τὸν πλησίον, τὸν ἕτερον; as Matt. 5, 22. and numerous other passages adduced by Schleus. Lex. v. § 7. To adduce (as the Commentators do) Classical examples of the above sense of ὑπερβαίνειν and πλεονεκτεῖν were needless. One only shall suffice, since it is an imitation (very antient indeed) of the present passage. Test. 12 Patriarch. where it is said, “a good man τὸν πλησίον οὐ πλεονεκτεῖ.”

6. ἐν τῷ πράγματι is well rendered in our Version *in any matter*; for Koppe observes, that μὴ ἐν τῷ πράγματι is for ἐν μηδένι πράγματι.

6. ἐκδικος ὁ Κυρίος περὶ πάντων τούτων. It is well remarked by Koppe, that the expression πάντων τούτων, intimates that the Apostle was speaking of more than one vice, namely, πορνεία. By τούτων is meant, the vices just mentioned. I would compare Joseph. 169. init. καὶ νόμος κολαστῆς γίνεται τῶν τοιούτων. Compare kindred passages in Gal. 5, 21. and Rom. 6, 9—11. and the notes. Διαμαρτύρομαι is a stronger term than μαρτ.

7. οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς Θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία, ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. These words present the only difficulty in the way of the interpretation of τὸ μὲ ὑπερβαίνειν—αὐτοῦ, which I have adopted, namely, that ἀκαθαρσία and ἁγιασμῷ seem to be solely meant of fornication, adultery, &c. There are two ways of removing this difficulty. Many Commentators, as Grot. and Koppe, take them to relate to vice in general; as supra 2, 3. Rom. 6, 19. and sometimes in the Sept. (See Schl.

* It is worthy of observation, that the Apostle in no less than three passages (Eph. 5, 5. the present, and Hebr. 13, 4.) associates the vices of fornication and covetousness, as being (we may conceive) the two especially prevalent.

Lex.) But I am inclined to think, with Wolf, that the Apostle here meant to refer, not to what occurred immediately before, but to the *preceding* instances; of which irregularity examples are frequent in the Apostle. I am the more inclined to suppose this, as the words following τὸν δόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον are far more applicable to πορνεία than to *over-reaching*. See (besides other examples) 1 Cor. 6, 18 and 19. In the ἐπὶ and ἐν we have an instance of the *variation* which so characterizes the Apostle's style, and similar to what is often met with in Thucydides.

8. τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν, "wherefore, then, he who sets lightly by these admonitions." On ἀθετ. see the note on Gal. 2, 31. By ἀνθρώπον the Apostle evidently means *himself*: and he adds ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν, since the contempt shown to *him* would be to *God* in the person of his representative. So the Apostle elsewhere says, "Now, then, we are ambassadors," &c.* The neglect, too, would be not only unto God, as giving these solemn prohibitions, but, what is worse, unto that God who had given them his Holy Spirit, by which they might be expected to resist "fleshly lusts which war against the soul." It is (I think) evident, that by the gifts of the Spirit we are here to understand, not the χαρίσματα, or supernatural gifts vouchsafed to *some*, but the *ordinary* influences of the Holy Spirit for sanctification, imparted to all: and in this view I prefer the common reading ἡμᾶς, which accords better with the humility of the Apostle; though the ὑμᾶς will not materially alter the sense.

9. περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν

* The Apostle here seems to have had in view our Lord's words, Luke 10, 16. ὁ ἀθετῶν, &c. "He that despiseth you, despiseth me: and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." In this passage St. Paul asserts his own inspiration in the strongest terms, and with the greatest solemnity; having in view to instruct the young and giddy, and all who despised his precepts concerning chastity as *too severe*. (Mackn., partly from Benson.)

ὑμῶν. Now follows an exhortation to *liberality* towards Christians ; and, as necessary to the performance of that duty, the virtue of peaceful industry is enjoined, so that they may “ have to give to him that needeth.”

9. φιλαδελφία, “ love to the brethren,” chiefly ὡς λόγόν δόσεως καὶ λήψεως, to use the words of the Apostle at Phil. 4, 15.; but also extending to kindness and benevolence in general. See Hebr. 13, 1. At γράφειν must be understood ἡμᾶς, “ there is no need for me to write to you.” It is observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle establishes the importance of the duty in question in a two-fold way ; 1st, by hinting that it is so necessary a thing as not to need being taught : for all things of great importance are plain and obvious ; 2dly, he rouses their shame, that he may excite them not to be found worse than he had thought them.”

9. αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς θεοδίδακτοὶ ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους, i. e. (as Rosenm. and Schleus. explain) “ ye have learnt it by your religion.” But something more is meant. Thus Zanch and Benson think that it also implies *following* the instruction so as really to *do* the thing. (See Benson’s references.) But this is somewhat precarious ; and the *doing* is mentioned just after. The antients, and many eminent moderns (as Erasm., Menoch., and Koppe) have rightly seen that it signifies Θεοπνευστός, *excited to give by the Holy Spirit* ; the disposition to give which they had evinced being, according to the usual custom of the Apostle, ascribed to that influence, which would be the strongest motive. Agreeably to this the Prophets (Is. 46, 3. Jer. 31, 34.) predicted : “ For all shall be taught of God ;” which includes the ordinary as well as extraordinary operations of the Spirit. Here Wets. aptly cites St. Barnabas, Ep. 21. apud Clem. Strom. 2. ὁ δὲ θεὸς, ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κυριεύων, δαΐη καὶ ὑμῶν σοφίαν, καὶ σύνεσιν, ἐπιστήμην, γνῶσιν τῶν δικαιωμάτων αὐτοῦ. Γίνεσθε οὖν θεοδίδακτοι.

10. καὶ γὰρ ποιεῖτε—Μακεδονίᾳ. “ And ye do show

this love not only in your own city, but in all Macedonia ;” meaning (as it is supposed) chiefly Berrhæa. The brethren of *other* countries are not mentioned, because (as Benson says) “they were probably acquainted with few but those of their own country ; though their affection, no doubt, extended to all the Christians whom they knew.”

10. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀ., περισσεύειν μᾶλλον, viz. ἐν τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ. Here, as often elsewhere, the Apostle makes his commendation serve as a stimulus to rouse them to still higher spiritual attainments.

11. φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν. Some Interpreters, as Koppe, would closely unite this with the preceding. Others here commence a new section. But this latter mode is at variance with the grammatical construction, and the former is hardly to be justified. It is better to place a semicolon, as in our Common Version, and to suppose that the Apostle, according to his usual custom, engrafts on the admonition to Christian beneficence *another*, but closely connected with the former, that of *quiet industry*, without which they could not fulfil the other duty.

The φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, *to strive, aim at*, imparts much energy to the sense, and is used both in the Classical writers and the New Testament, as Rom. 15, 20. φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, and 1 Cor. 5, 9. φιλοτιμούμεθα εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι. The term ἡσυχάζειν is supposed by most Commentators to be here used in reference to a busy, curious, meddling, pragmatical spirit prevailing among some of the Thessalonians. And to this it is sometimes *opposed*. See 2 Thess. 3, 6, 11 and 12. Others think that it refers to political subordination, in opposition to a seditious spirit. Some antients, too, (and also Benson) have their speculations on this subject, more ingenious than solid. I cannot but take the word in its most extensive application, as meant to discountenance that *restless spirit* and unsettled temper, and consequent indisposition to steady labour so characteristic of the Greeks,

and which the high mental excitement of a new religion would rather tend to *increase*,* especially as the large sums bestowed by the richer on the poorer brethren could not but weaken the principle that spurs man to industry. So Theodoret well observes :
 χορηγεῖν συνέβαινε γὰρ, τοὺς μὲν φιλοτίμως τοῖς δεομένοις τὴν χρεῖαν, τοὺς δὲ διὰ τὴν τούτων φιλοτιμίαν ἀμελείαν τῆς ἐργασίας· εἰκότως τοίνυν καὶ κείνους ἐπήνεσε, καὶ τούτοις τὰ πρόσφορα συνεβούλευσε.

The phrase πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια is partly exegetical of ἡσυχάζειν. Thus Hesych. joins: ἰδιοπραγεῖν, ἴδια πράττειν ἡσυχάζειν. To which may be added Plato 680 A. ἡσυχίαν ἔχων καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράττων. Thucyd. L. 1, 32. where are joined ἰδιοπραγμονεῖν and ἡσυχάζειν. And elsewhere Thucyd. has ἡσυχίαν ἀπραγμόνα. But it is especially levelled against a pragmatistical and meddling spirit. "So (observes Grot.) those who act otherwise are called ἀλλοτριοεπισκόποι, 1 Pet. 4, 15., περιεργαζόμενοι, 2 Thess. 3, 11. By the Classical writers such are called πολυπράγμονες. See Hom. Od.

* Not to mention that the introduction of knowledge and intellectual cultivation to an uninformed mind is apt to unsettle it, and indispose it to secular occupation, especially manual labour. Would to God that those who *hurry* forward plans for the unlimited intellectual instruction of the labouring classes would think of this! In which view it may not be improper to introduce an observation made by me eleven years ago in an Episcopal Visitation Sermon, p. 35. "Highly does it behove us (the Clergy) to watch the *possible dangers* of such *experiments* as are now making on the lower classes by general education, and to take especial care that their minds be largely stored with the sound and useful Christian knowledge provided for them in the Tracts of our venerable Church Society. By thus *adapting the education of the poor to their actual condition*, as well as to the peculiar exigencies of our own times, we shall form a rising generation conscientiously attached to our laws and our Church; rooted in Christian faith, and zealous of those good works which are the surest proofs of its sincerity, and the fairest fruits of its efficacy." Some of the dangers to which I have there adverted have become manifest, and *others* are disclosing themselves; and therefore it may not be unseasonable thus to *repeat* these representations; especially as the above view is confirmed by the recent opinion of an eminent Prelate: "Whether the *experiment* of universal education shall be productive of good or evil depends upon the Clergy." Bp. Blomfield's Charge at his Primary Visitation.

21, 350. Wets. gives many examples of the phrase τὰ ἴδια πράττειν, which signifies to mind one's own business. See Phryn. and T. Mag. So Xen. de Socrat. ὡς χαλεπὸν ὁ βίος Ἀθήνησιν εἶη ἀνδρὶ βουλομένῳ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράττειν, "to quietly mind his own business." And so Lysias often, Porph. V. P. 54. and Liban. 451.

11. καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν ὑμῶν. It is strange that Whitby should take this to be an injunction to work *themselves*, and not leave all to their *slaves*. An interpretation which, if it were admitted, would *prove too much*; for as to the limitation "and not leave all to their slaves," it will not consist with the sense in question, which could only be, *do their own work*, without putting *any* on their slaves, i. e. αὐτουργεῖν; so in Thucyd. 1, 141. οἱ αὐτουργοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (where I shall have much to annotate). But *this* the Apostle could not mean; nor is it likely that the Thessalonian Christians, who were mostly of the poorer class, employed slaves. The term ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χερσίν, evidently denotes manual labour, whether agricultural, commercial, or handicraft, including what we call manufactures. The ἰδίαις hints at the *contrary* conduct, namely, living on the bounty of others. So that I cannot think, with Dr. Mackn., that it ought to be cancelled, on the authority of some MSS. and Fathers (for Versions are *here* no evidence). We may compare Eph. 4, 28. ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς χερσίν, ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδίδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι, where see the notes. Of course the admonition could only have been intended for those whom it concerned, namely, the labouring classes; though labour, in a certain sense, is obligatory on all. So Benson, whose sensible remarks on this whole passage deserve attention.

12. ἵνα περιπατῆτε—ἔχητε. Here the Apostle suggests reasons for their so doing. The first clause is very similar to Col. 4, 5. ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω, i. e. σοφῶς περιπατεῖτε, &c. The οἱ ἕξω are those out of the pale of the Church; as 1 Cor. 5, 12 and 13, &c. Εὐσχημόνως. The phrase εὐσχημόνως

περιπατεῖν also occurs at 1 Cor. 14, 40. Rom. 13, 13. and signifies to *act decorously and creditably*. This is not, with most Commentators, to be referred solely to what is implied in the words following καὶ μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε (though mendicity would be a great discredit to the Christian profession), but to *all* that went before; for by cultivating quiet, orderly, and industrious habits they could not but gain the good opinion of all classes of the Heathens, as being estimable in all relations of life, both political and civil.

The words καὶ μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε serve to suggest *another reason* for industry, namely, the not being beholden to any man for a subsistence. At μηδενὸς I would supply, not ἀνθρώπου, but πράγματος. And I would not understand it (with Theophyl. and some moderns) of begging from Heathens (which, we may suppose, would be little likely), but begging *at all*: for even living on the alms of Christian brethren would be discreditable in respect to the Heathens; since reason itself would suggest to *them* how much at variance this is with the principles of virtue and natural religion.*

13—18. The Apostle had intimated that he wished to make the Thessalonians another visit, in order to perfect that which was lacking in their faith. Part of what he says here seems to be what he further wanted to teach them.† But having heard of their beha-

* It is obvious how equally this will apply to the practice of a Church which fosters and rears up swarms of lazy drones in her begging Friars; a practice here even disapproved of by Theophyl., who occasionally countenances monkery. His words are these: Εἰ γὰρ οἱ πιστοὶ σκανδαλίζονται, ὅταν ἴδωσιν ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῇ ἐπαυτοῦντα, (διὸ καὶ Χριστεμπόρους τοὺς τοιοῦτους καλοῦσι) πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ ἄπιστοι. It is only surprising how practices so inconsistent with the Apostle's words should ever have been introduced. The following sentiment of a most *enlightened Jew* is highly honourable to him, and would scarcely have been unworthy of the Apostle himself: "He that so gives himself to the study of the Law as to neglect his own proper business, and live upon alms, extinguishes the light of religion, and brings evil upon himself, and loss of life in a future state." Maimonides de Studio Legis, ch. 3. § 8.

† So Theophyl.: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἦν αὐτοῖς περὶ τούτου διαλεχθεῖς, ἕως· ἵνα μυστήριον τι μέλλει ἀνακαλύψαι.

viour on the death of their Christian friends, he would not defer giving them this admonition, and further instruction, till he could go to them in person; but thought fit to write what is contained in this section 13—18.

Their *heathen* neighbours, upon the death of their friends, hired men to play, in a mournful manner, upon a pipe or trumpet; and they hired women, also, to shed tears, howl, beat their breasts, tear their hair, and the like, to increase the lamentation. These attended soon after the person expired. When the corpse was carried out to burial, they tore off their hair, rent their garments, cut their flesh, especially their hands and arms, and tore their cheeks. At the grave they set down the corpse, and went round the bier, or round the grave after the corpse was interred; and, for some time after, they abstained from their usual food and lived upon lentils, pulse, beans, and some of the meanest and coarsest diet. These were originally the customs of the *Heathens*; though they were not the same in all countries. But, in process of time, many of them were imitated by the *Jews*. (See Lev. 19, 27, 28. and 21, 5. Deut. 14, 1. Is. 15, 2. Jer. 16, 6, 7, and 41, 4, 5. and 48, 36, 37. Ezek. 7, 18. Amos 3, 10. Baruch 6, 31, 32. Matth. 9, 23. *Spencer de Leg. lib. p. 11, 35, &c.* Herodot. L. 2. c. 35. and L. 6. c. 58.) And as those customs in lamenting for the dead were originally *Heathen*, they are here mentioned and condemned as such. For all the *Jews*, except the Sadducees, had hope of the resurrection of good men to an happy immortality; but the *Heathens* had no such hope. As the Christians at Thessalonica kept up those heathenish rites and customs, and sorrowed excessively upon the death of their Christian friends, the Apostle says three things to dry up their tears. 1st. He briefly repeats what he had already taught them concerning the resurrection of the pious dead to an happy immortality; in consequence of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and according to his frequent and express promise. 2dly. He makes this new discovery that the last generation should not die at all, but be, on a sudden, changed into incorruptible. 3dly. He adds another new discovery, viz. that those who are alive at Christ's second coming shall not anticipate the dead: but that, when the dead are raised, both shall be taken up together to meet the Lord.

Koppe, too, illustrates the scope and intent of this whole portion of Scripture in a long and laboured annotation, to which I can only refer.

The remarks of the learned Commentator are certainly very ingenious, and, indeed, instructive, but in some respects too fanciful. They bear some resemblance to that conjecture of Saurin (Serm. 6. No. 1.), that the desire which prevailed in Christians to see Christ when he should appear for judgment, made them lament those of their brethren who died, as it were, cut off from that hope; in reference to which he assures them that they shall be on a level with their brethren thus found alive." But, as Doddr. observes, it may be questioned whether on this hypothesis the Apostle does not

indirectly tell them that there was no particular room for such lamentations, as they themselves, and many succeeding generations, might die before the coming of our Lord.

13. οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. A formula not unfrequent with the Apostle (as Rom. 1, 13. 11, 25. 1 Cor. 12, 1. 2 Cor. 1, 8., &c.), in which there is a meiosis for, "I would have you to well know and attend to this admonition." Περὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, "respecting the dead (among you)." A common euphemism, occurring in Matt. 9, 24. Luke 8, 52. Joh. 11, 4. 11, 13 & 14. 1 Cor. 15, 20. The reading *κοιμωμένων*, found in some MSS. and Fathers, and approved by Rosenm., is a needless emendation. *Κεκοιμημένων* signifies those who *have* died, *the dead*, of course including all those who shall die. From ignorance of the nature of this term Benson trifles egregiously.

13. ἵνα μὴ λυπησθε, "that ye be not (excessively) grieved." So Theodoret: οὐ παντελῶς καλύει τὴν λυπὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμετρίαν ἐκβάλλει, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐλπίδι ψυχαγωγεῖ, οἱ γὰρ ταύτην οὐκ ἔχοντες ἔχουσι τῆς ἀμέτρου λύπης ἀπολογία. It is well observed by Benson, "that Christianity aims not at the rooting out the passions, appetites, and afflictions; but to moderate and duly regulate them." By the οἱ λοιποὶ are meant those out of the pale of Christianity, whether Heathens or Jews. Οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα, i. e. (as Grot., Benson, and Koppe explain) "who have not a sure (i. e. a Christian) hope." For the Heathens had none, and the Jews a very faint one; at least if we may judge from the *excessive* grief which they indulged at funerals. Benson would confine the οἱ λοιποὶ to the *Gentiles*, and not include the *Jews*. But, as Grot. and Koppe rightly observe, the term must here have the same extent of signification as οἱ ἔξω just before. And so it is used at Eph. 2, 3. & 4, 17. and infra 5, 6. By the ἐλπίδα (I repeat) is meant a sure and well grounded hope and expectation, and the whole phrase must be taken in a *popular* sense. For (as Benson observes) that even the Heathens *hoped* that the

soul would survive the body, is abundantly evident from their writings. (See more in the note of the learned Doctor.*)

14. εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν—ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. There is no reason to take γὰρ (with Koppe and Benson) as a particle of transition: and εἰ for ὥς. We have here an *argumentum ex loco parium ductum*, as Crell. says, (whom see). The construction and course of reasoning will be sufficiently plain, if in the second member we supply, not πιστεύομεν, but πιστεύωμεν, and render: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also (*must* we believe) that God will raise up those who sleep in Jesus, together with him." The argument is *popular*, and like that at 1 Cor. c. 15., where see the notes. Διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Of this the sense above expressed seems to be the most natural; and it is supported by the authority of many antients, and most moderns. And so Koppe, who compares the διὰ to the Heb. כ (which the

* There would be no end (he says) of transcribing passages from Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, &c., to show that they *had* that hope. The Greek and Roman Philosophers, excepting the Epicureans and Sceptics, and a few others, believed in a future state. "Indeed (continues Dr. Benson) the vulgar had gross conceptions of the future state, owing, in a great measure, to the mythological and symbolical representations of the poets and philosophers, and which they explained only to their learned hearers. And the *exoteric* and *esoteric* philosophy had a reference only to the difference of the vulgar and political from the philosophical notions of a future state, and not at all to the reality and belief in it, which was always believed, in different ways of explication, by the learned and unlearned, by the poets and philosophers, as well as by the common people. (See Mr. Jackson, *ibid.*) However, as their notions of the future state were generally dark and cloudy, low and grovelling; as their best philosophers sometimes expressed themselves with great diffidence and hesitation, and their poets gave themselves such unbounded licence; the people were very much confounded, and, at certain intervals, ready to fear that death might prove an utter extinction of the man. *That was the spirit of bondage* which created the most uneasy and distressing fears: but Christianity has dissipated those fears, and brings with it *the spirit of adoption*, whereby we look upon our God as our Father, who will raise us from the dead, and put us in possession of the most pure and virtuous enjoyments, and that for ever."

Syriac has here), which often means *ἐν*. The *διὰ* may, however, with some antients and moderns, be taken in the sense of *per*; though (as Koppe observes) somewhat harshly. See the instructive note of Benson.

15. *τοῦτο γὰρ—κοιμηθέντας*, “For this, moreover, I tell you, on the authority of the Lord, that such of us as shall be left alive by the Lord, will not anticipate those who are then dead,” namely, in being glorified. *Ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου*. It is well observed by Benson that St. Paul uses this phrase in allusion to that with which the Prophets prefaced their messages (See 1 Kings 13, 17 & 18. 20, 35.), to indicate that what he was about to say was not his own invention, but a Divine revelation. In what *way* the revelation was made, whether by the words of Christ himself, or through the medium of the Holy Spirit, we know not. Chrysost. and Theophyl. say : *ῥητῶς ἤκουσε παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου, ὥσπερ καὶ κείνοι. Μακάριον ἐστὶ διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν*. In either case it was the *word of the Lord*, and consequently (as Doddr. remarks) “there can be no room to suppose St. Paul mistaken in any circumstance of the ensuing account.”

15. *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι*. On the sense of *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*, &c. Commentators are not agreed. Many moderns, taking the words in their full sense, think they express the Apostle’s belief that he and some of them should survive until the day of the Lord. On the other hand, the antients and most moderns think he uses the figure *κοινωνίᾳ* to denote the Christians who should be alive at the last day. So Theophyl. : *Ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ ζῶντες, λέγων, οὐ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ φησιν (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἔμελλε ζῆν) ἀλλὰ τοὺς πιστοὺς λέγει διὸ προσέθηκεν, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρούσῃαν τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ προσώπῳ πάντας τοὺς τότε εὐριθισομένους ζῶντας δηλοῖ. Μεθόδος δὲ ὁ μακάριος, ζῶντας, τὰς ψυχὰς λέγει*. See also Chrys., Œcumen., and Theodoret. On *this* side of the question there is a powerful annotation

by Dr. Benson, in which he has been more successful in showing that there is no proof that St. Paul and the other Apostles supposed the day of judgment was at hand (on which see also Doddr.), than in establishing the *κοινωνίαις* in question. I can only *refer* the reader to his valuable note; and it is impossible for me to enter at large into so extensive a question, and one so little connected with a *critical* digest of annotation. I will only say that the *κοινωνίαις* cannot (I think) be admitted, for the reasons given by Grot. But it seems prudent to steer a middle course between the two extremes, and suppose (as we well may) that though the *ἡμεῖς* does not imply that the Apostle *thought* he should live till the last day, yet that he thought it *possible* the last day was so near at hand that *some* then living might see it, and having no certain information, he expresses himself indefinitely. And surely (to use the words of Doddr.) an ignorance on this point was by no means inconsistent with a knowledge of *whatever* was necessary to the preaching of the Gospel. Compare Mark 13, 32. and 1 Cor. 15, 51. It must, however, be observed, that all that is here said has reference (as at 1 Cor. 15.) to the case of the *righteous*.

15. οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, “we who are survivors.” Εἰς παρουσίαν, “unto the coming.” Οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας, “shall by no means anticipate the dead (in our assuming glorified bodies).” Οὐ μὴ, *by no means*. See the note on 1 Cor. 15. Wets. here remarks: “Si animæ piorum, quamprimum ex corpore excedunt, in cœlum avolant, et cum Christo vivunt, hanc doctrinam videtur nunc debuisse Paulum inculcare Thessalonicensibus; imo si hac doctrinâ ex institutione Apostolorum ab initio imbuti fuissent, concipi nequit, quomodo fieri potuerit, ut in eam sententiam propensiores essent, quæ statuit, superstites citius quam mortuos ad Christum perventuros.”

16. ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι—οὐρανοῦ. Here

(as Koppe observes) we have a description of the solemn advent of Christ, expressed by images and types derived from the triumphal entrance of a human king taking possession of a kingdom with an armed force. Ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου, καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ. Koppe and Rosenm. think that this is for ἐν κελεύσματι διὰ φωνῆς ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ σάλπιγγι. Which is preferable to the mode of interpretation adopted by Grot., who takes ἐν κελεύσματι, with the Vulg., in the sense *in jussu*, also countenanced by the Syriac Translators. They probably read κελεύματι. One thing is plain, that the ἐν answers to the Heb. ב, *by, at*; and ἐν κελεύσματι nearly corresponds to the Classical phrase ἀπὸ κελεύματος, of which examples in abundance are adduced by Wets. and others, from which it appears to have denoted that *loud shout* by which soldiers or sailors excited themselves on rushing to battle; or by which associated labourers encourage themselves to any conjoint effort of strength; or, in a general way, any loud shout of a single individual, as of a boatswain, which was (I think) uttered with a speaking trumpet. However, it seems prudent not to *confound* the three particulars together; though to thoroughly comprehend the *mode* of their operation it were vain to attempt, and on so awful a subject it behoves us reverently to suppress prying curiosity. Who, for instance, is meant by ἀρχαγγέλου? *An* archangel. I dare not venture even to conjecture. Certainly not (as Pierce and others suppose) *Christ*. Nor can I consent, with most recent Commentators, to decline the difficulty by sinking all into metaphor and figure. Thus Benson: "The coming of Christ, as universal judge, will be very public and magnificent; and all mankind shall be suffered to appear before him." If I might venture to express a conjecture, I should suggest that possibly by the κελεύσματι may be meant some inexpressibly awful crash of thunder, accompanied, perhaps, with a pealing roar from most universal subterraneous convulsions, which, even in

the ordinary course of nature, as we learn from travellers (see Humboldt on the Andes), exceed the noise produced by the discharge of a whole park of artillery!

16. καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον. By *the dead in Christ* are evidently meant those that die in the faith and fear of Christ, i. e. faithful Christians. For, as the best Commentators are agreed, nothing is either here, or at 1 Cor. 15., said of the *wicked*, dead or living (on which Mackn. has many needless speculations); as the description of *their* case could have been no consolation to Christians under the loss of friends. These, then, it is said, shall rise first.

17. ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα, “Then we who are left alive shall be caught up together with him to the clouds, in order to meet the Lord in the air.” The ἅμα σὺν is a stronger expression than ἅμα, or σὺν singly. Ἀρπ. is for ἀναρπ. On the *mode* in which this is to be effected Commentators variously speculate. At ἐν νεφέλαις Koppe supplies ὀχλήσαντες (on which may be compared Ps. 68, 4. and Is. 19, 1.). And so most Commentators, who render: “in nubibus.” But I prefer, with others, *in nubes*, unto the clouds, which the nature of the preceding verb seems to require. Unless εἰς ἀέρα be construed (as it is done by Rosenm. and others) with ἀναρπ. But this is a violent and unnecessary hyperbaton. Εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ Κυρίου. A phrase plainly Hebraic (with which Koppe compares the Heb. לִקְרַאת אֲדֹנָי), for ἀπαντησάντες τῷ Κυρίῳ. The being caught up and introduced to the Lord in the air is (as Theophyl. observes) a token of honour, as opposed to the state of the wicked, who shall await the Judge below.

17. καὶ οὕτω, “And then.” A sense common after καὶ, on which I have before treated. Πάντοτε, *everlastingly*. The expression σὺν Κυρίῳ (which, as Theophyl. says, implies τὸ κεφαλαιὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν καρποῦσθαι) denotes participation in kingdom, glory, and

felicity. See Joh. 14, 2 & 3. 17, 29. 2 Tim. 2, 12. Rom. 8, 17. It may, however, be collected from these words (as Whitby thinks) that even the souls of the faithful are not *with* the *Lord*, or in his celestial presence before the resurrection.

18. ὥστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις, "So then (this being the case) console each other (ye who are troubled) with these (comforting) sayings and assurances."

CHAP. V.

VERSE 1. περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων—γράφεσθαι. As the Apostle had, in the last section, treated of the second coming of Christ, of the resurrection of the pious dead, of the transformation of the living, and of their being all made happy with Christ; it would be likely enough that persons of too curious and inquisitive a temper would be ready to inquire (as our Lord's disciples did, Matt. 24, 3.), "Tell us, *when* shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of Christ's coming, and of the end of the world?" He therefore (ver. 1—11.) endeavours to divert their minds from such an improper enquiry to something of more moment; viz. that they should live such an holy life as to be always prepared for that coming of Christ, which, whenever it happens, will surprise the wicked world, but be unspeakable joy to the righteous. (Benson.)

It is not, Koppe thinks, necessary to nicely discriminate between the senses of χρόνων and καίρων; since they are often confounded in the New Testament. (See Schleus. Lex. on these words.) Yet as καίρος does sometimes, in the New Testament, denote the tempus opportunum, or the *critical season* for doing any thing, so, I think, with most Commentators, it may have that sense here. I would render: "Of the time and exact season of Christ's coming." See Pole's Syn. Οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφεσθαι. On this syntax see the note supra 4, 9. The

expression signifies, "it is unnecessary;" and perhaps it may be put by meiosis (as the antients and Zanch think) *it were useless, nay improper*, περιττὸν καὶ ἀσύμφορον.

2. αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε, "Ye yourselves know all that is necessary, and what our Lord hath told you." Ὅτι ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου—ἔρχεται. By the day of the Lord is not meant (as Hamm. and Schoettg. suppose) that of the *destruction of Jerusalem*, nor (as Whitby) of the destruction of Jerusalem *and also* the last advent, but solely the *latter*. In οἶδατε there is an allusion to what is recorded in Matt. 24, 43., and elsewhere. "ἔρχεται, "is to come."

3. ὅταν γὰρ λέγωσιν—ἐκφύγωσιν. The Apostle now proceeds to illustrate the *effect* of the sudden advent of the Lord: but in order to make his remarks the more impressive,* he adverts solely to its effect on the secure, careless, and unprepared, i. e. the wicked. And so our Lord speaks of it, Matt. 24, 38., with which compare Jer. 49, 24. See Benson.

At εἰρήνη and ἀσφάλεια must be understood ἐστι. See Ez. 13, 10. The ὀλεθρος signifies not so much *destruction*, as *perdition*, and that judicial; as appears from the nature of the thing, and from 2 Thess. 1, 9. ὀλεθρον αἰώνιον. 1 Tim. 5, 9. εἰς ὀλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν. Hesych. ὀλεθρον, εἰς ἄδην. Theodoret well paraphrases: τῆς θεογνωσίας τὴν ἀκτῖνα δεξάμενοι, φεύγετε τὰ τοῦ σκότου ἐπιτηδεύματα, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαπιναίως ὑμῖν ἐπενεχθῇ τῆς τιμωρίας ἡ ψῆφος.

Αἰφνίδιος, *sudden, unexpected*. A very frequent sense; so that the examples adduced by the Philologists are superfluous. Compare Rom. 13, 12.

4, 5. ὑμεῖς—καταλάβη. The comparison of Christ's

* And also, it should seem, to give a hint with respect to the fate of the wicked at the great day, who were not adverted to in the preceding passage on the resurrection, &c. It is here remarked by Koppe: "Cum hoc extremo Christi adventu, necessario conjunctus fore credebatur hostium ejus interitus; similitudine iterum a rege humano sumptâ, qui regno feliciter occupato imperii sui rebelles pœnis ac suppliciis multare solet."

sudden advent to the coming of a thief in the night, seems to have suggested the occasion of expressing by phrases taken from the shining brightness of *light* and *day*, the mind of Christians fully prepared by his Apostolical instruction for this awful event. (Koppe.)

The Apostle having compared our Lord's sudden and unexpected coming to judgment to a thief's coming in the night, from thence takes occasion to call such as were ignorant of the Divine will, *children of night and of darkness*; and, by way of opposition, such as were illuminated with the knowledge of it, *children of light and of day*: and this allusion he carries on, ver. 4—10. (Benson.)

Υμεῖς is emphatical; and σκότου signifies wilful ignorance of divine truths, with an adjunct notion of the vice and hardness of heart accompanying it. So Theophyl.: οὐ σκοτεινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον ἔχετε βίον. The Apostle's meaning is not very obscure; though in the use of the metaphor there is somewhat of confusion. Rosenm. explains thus: "To those who are already in light, light is not troublesome and unexpected; so neither to you Christians will that day be unwelcome or unexpected, in which every one's life shall be made manifest." I would here compare Cic. ad Attic. 10, 8. Non fuisset et illa nox tam acerba Africano, sapientissimo viro, non tam dirus ille dies Sullacas calidissimo viro C. Mario, si nihil utrumque eorum fefellisset.

From the day of the Lord the Apostle then passes to the *general* notion of day, 5—8. In the plural υἱοὶ and φῶτος, the best Commentators recognise a Hebraism, by which בן (*son*) expresses any sort of close connection and strong similarity; so that by υἱοὶ φωτός are meant those endued with the light of the Gospel. So υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας at Eph. 2, 2., and ἀπαλείας at 2 Thess. 2, 3.

6, 7. In these verses is continued the allusion to night and day, of which the former is given to indulgence, by the sensual to drunkenness, &c.; and

by all to security and sleep. So Benson: "The Apostle, having compared Christ's coming to that of a thief in the night, he then represented bad men as children of darkness, liable to be surprised and destroyed; and good Christians, as children of light and of day. *That* led him to take notice how men commonly spend the night, in sleeping or drunkenness. From thence he took occasion to recommend to Christians, who are children of day, to behave accordingly, to watch and be sober."

The best Commentators are agreed that καθευδ. answers to the term *stertere* of the Latin; q. d. "Let us not *doze* and *nod* in thoughtlessness and vice, but let us watch and be wakeful and sober." Γρηγορ. is equivalent to ἀγρυπνεῖν in Luke 31, 36. where see the note. The metaphorical sense here of νήφειν is too well known to need illustration. One example will suffice. Plut. 841. νήφειν λέγων καὶ ἀγρυπνεῖν, ὅπως ἔξῃ τοῖς ἄλλοις μεθύειν καὶ καθεύδειν. Both words are joined in 1 Pet. 5, 8. Koppe observes, that after removing the metaphor, the sense of the two expressions will be as follows: "sollers et strenuus esse in bene honestèque agendo; et in devitandis vitiis ac sceleribus quibusvis esse diligens." And he renders the words of ver. 7.: "Negligens esse in rectè agendo, vitiisque indulgere, homines tantum eos decet, qui dei voluntatem de eo, quod agendum aut omittendum sit, non fuerunt edocti."

With respect to the νυκτὸς μεθύουσιν, it may be observed, with Raphel, that the being drunken in the *day* time was thought the greatest disgrace. And Wets. cites Polyb. Exc. Leg. 8. ἐκπαθῇ δὲ γεγονότα καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀκρατοποσίας, ὥστε καὶ μετ' ἡμέραν πλεονάκεις μεθύοντα καταφανῇ γενέσθαι τοῖς φίλοις. Apulej. scortis et diurnis potationibus exercitatus. To which I add Athen. 433 B. οὐκ ἐστ' ἀποτάκτου, Ἡμέρα οἰνώσαι σῶμα ἀμέτροισι πότοις. Hor. Sat. 1. Ebrius et, magnum quod dedecus, obambulet *Ante noctem* facibus. Plato Com. ap. Athen. 279 A. πότους ἐωθέ-

νοὺς Πίνει διὰ σε. So also 2 Pet. 2, 13. ἡδονὴν ἡγοούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν.

8. ἡμεῖς δὲ—ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας. The Apostle now glides into another and favourite comparison (compare Eph. 6, 14. and Is. 11, 5. 59, 17.), taken from *armour*, sheathed in which, and prepared for battle, the soldier encounters all perils, till he gain the victory. Then he shows how Christians ought to prepare themselves for that day, namely, by faith, love, and hope. (Koppe and Rosenm.)

Πίστις, firm persuasion of the Messiahship of Jesus, and constancy in supporting it under calamity and persecution. Ἀγάπη, “love and good will to all men, both Christians and others. Ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, “a lively hope of finally obtaining the eternal rewards promised to Christian obedience in the Messiah’s kingdom.” See Benson. And compare Hebr. 6, 19. The *article* at ἐλπ. and σωτ. would have been better; as in Jos. 1319, 8. ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας.

The ratio of the allusions in the *breast-plate* and *helmet*, it is unnecessary to minutely discuss; since all is plain and obvious, and it may suffice to refer to the parallel passage of Eph. 6, 11.; and I will only add that the words of the *present* confirm my criticism on those of *that* passage, that the Apostle only intended to represent the *defensive* supports of the Gospel; and this will be the best answer to the question often proposed and anxiously debated, why the Apostle has here altered the particulars of the comparison, and somewhat varied their application?

9, 10. These verses, Koppe observes, are both especially to be referred to the ἐλπ. σωτηρίας at ver. 8.; and he gives the following as the general sense: “spe futurâ felicitatis verè et jure suo possunt Christiani animum inter calamitates erigere, quippe voluntate et promissis divinis eadem nitatur.” With the ἔθετο Koppe and Rosenm. compare a similar use of the Hebr. עָשָׂה and יָצַח, *appoint* and *destine*, Gen. 17, 5. Jer. 1, 5. Ὁργάν, *punishment*; as 1, 10. The

περιποιήσιν is for εἰς τὸ περιποιεῖσθαι, and accommodated to ὄργην. The phrase, however, is often used, as 2 Thess. 2, 14. and Hebr. 10, 39. Benson explains: "The design of God in sending his son into this world, was not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He did not reveal the Gospel unto mankind, that they might sin with the greater aggravation, and so be the more severely punished. But the motive was love, and the design was mercy. And he hath appointed none to wrath but such as wilfully and obstinately refuse his gracious offers, and persist in vice and wickedness." See his numerous Scriptural proofs. Theophyl. draws the following conclusion: Ὁφείλομεν οὖν ἐλπίζειν ἐν κινδύνοις χρηστὰ καὶ μεγάλα. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύσαμεν ὅτι τοῦ Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἐλπίζομεν ὅτι καὶ πολλῶ μᾶλλον τῶν κινδύνων τούτων ἐξέλκεται.

With respect to the words τοῦ ἀποθανόντος—ζήσωμεν, I would observe that the ancients rightly considered γρηγ. and καθ. as put for ζῶμεν and ἀποθάνωμεν; and they notice the antanaclasis. This, too, is supported by the best modern Commentators, of whom Benson has given the most satisfactory account of the sense. It is, therefore, strange that Whitby should have taken καθ. in the *physical* sense, and rendered γρηγορώμεν, "be on our guard." Benson explains the words ἵνα—ζήσωμεν as if they denoted the plan of salvation by Christ; which is not the case; and, what is worse, in laying down that plan the Doctor has omitted the fundamental doctrine of the *atonement*, and lowers the whole almost down to the level of Socinianism. The Apostle, however (as the best Commentators are agreed), only meant to say that whether we be alive, or dead, at that day, it matters not; the living with Christ, or enjoying eternal happiness with him (see *supra* 4, 17.), shall be equally our portion. So that (as Theoph. infers) "we may fearlessly meet dangers, or even death; for even if we die, we shall live, as he who so loved us as to die for us, liveth."

11. διὸ παρακαλεῖτε—ποιεῖτε. Here we have a repetition, *per epanalepsin*, of what was said at 4, 18.; the intermediate matter on the suddenness of Christ's coming, and the necessity of previous preparation, being in some measure parenthetical and digressive. In resuming, however, the thread of the discourse, the Apostle uses a metaphorical expression of great beauty, in which there is an architectural figure, such as in 1 Cor. 8, 1. 10, 23. 14, 17. and Jude 20., where see the notes. This *edifying one another* (as Benson says) was, either by increasing one another's knowledge, strengthening their faith and hope, or promoting their holiness.

Εἰς τὸν ἕνα is for ἀλλήλους: an idiom rare in the Classical writers; though Kypke cites Dionys. Hal. p. 134. ὁπότε ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτύρου συναλλάγματος ἀμφίλογόν τι γένοιτο ἐνὶ πρὸς ἕνα.

11. καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε, q. d. "I need hardly have given the exhortation, since ye already do this." We may observe that this praise, mixed with the exhortation, is delicately thrown in, to make it the more effectual. Of which I have noted an example in Aristid. T. 1. 232, 11. σχεδὸν δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὃ ποιεῖτε παρήνεσα. Grot. compares the adage: σπευδόντα καὶ αὐτὸν ὀτρύνω.

12—14. Having exhorted them to comfort and edify one another, the Apostle adds other such exhortations as he found, from Timothy, were necessary. Lest they should imagine they had no occasion for religious teachers,* he enjoins them to show all due respect to their spiritual pastors and masters; and to *these* he hints *their* reciprocal duties to their *people*. (See Grot. and Benson.)

12. ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς, "we entreat you." See 4, 1. Εἰδέναι. Grot. compares *respicere, spectare, περι-*

* So Theophyl.: ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσιν ὅτι εἰς τὸ διδασκάλου ἀξίωμα αὐτοὺς ἀνήγαγε, καὶ κατεπαρθῶσιν ἐκείνων, φησὶν· ὅτι εἰ καὶ ὑμῖν ἐπέτρεψα τὴν ἀλλήλων οἰκοδομὴν, πλὴν παρακαλῶ ἵνα ἐκείνους διὰ τιμῆς ἔχητε· πολλοὶ γάρ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑπομένειν ἀναγκάζονται δυσχερῆ, ἃ ἡ τιμὴ αὐτοῖς μετρίως γοῦν ἐπικουφιεῖ.

βλεπτον, and *spectabilis*. The recent Commentators explain it *rationem habere*. I conceive that the principal sense is that expressed by Theophyl., διὰ τιμῆς ἔχειν. So Hesiod, Op. 187. Some render it *show gratitude to*. The term indeed seems to include a mixture of respect, obedience, and gratitude shown especially in making due provision for their wants.

As to the persons of whom this is to be understood, the Apostle has been thought to advert to three distinct classes of spiritual pastors, viz. (to use the words of Mackn.) 1. Τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν, *Those who laboured among them*, in the works of the ministry, by preaching, catechising, and dispensing the sacraments. 2. Τοὺς προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν, *Those who presided over them*; that is, who in their public meetings for worship showed in what order individuals were to exercise their spiritual gifts; and appointed the places and times of these meetings. 3. Τοὺς νοουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς, *Those who observed the behaviour of individuals, and gave to such as were faulty the admonitions and reproofs necessary to their amendment*. “For νοουθετέω (says he) signifies to *admonish with reproof*. See Tit. 3, 10.” He thinks it probable that this office belonged to the Bishops. As to κοπιῶντας, it is plain that, from the nature of the subject τῷ λόγῳ must be supplied. It is expressed in 1 Tim. 5, 17. The προϊστάμενοι are supposed by the best Commentators to be the same with προεστῶτες, ἐπισκόποι, πρεσβύτεροι, ποιμένες (Compare 1 Tim. 5, 17. and 3, 2. and Eph. 4, 11.), like the Jewish Archisynagogi. Koppe, however, maintains that the terms νουθετ. and προϊσταμενοι are not meant of various kinds of Presbyters (some Bishops, and others teachers, See Acts 20, 17. compared with 28, Phil. 1, 1. 1 Tim. 3, 2. seq.), but of the same persons comprehended, in this verse, under the more general term κοπιῶντες. Κοπ. is indeed a very general term to denote “labouring in the promulgation of the Gospel;” as Rom. 16, 6 & 12. 1 Cor. 15, 10. 16, 16. Gal. 4, 11. Phil. 2, 16. Col. 1, 29. and 1 Tim. 4, 10. 5, 17. But, upon the whole, I see not how we can come to any determinate opinion on the nature of the ecclesiastical government of the Thessalonian church, for want of more exact information than we possess. Yet it seems probable that by κοπιῶντες are denoted those who occupied the ordinary offices of teaching, and by the προϊστάμενοι, the rulers of the church; and that νοουθετοῦντας is a general term applicable to both. I certainly see not how we can here recognise any Bishops or Bishop properly so called. Nor does there seem, as yet, to have been any Bishop appointed. “It was common (says Benson) with St. Paul to collect a church, and impart some spiritual gifts and miraculous powers unto them; and then leave them for some time, without ordaining Bishops and deacons among them. Acts 14, 1. 21, 23. 1 Tim. 5, 22. Tit. 1, 5. and many other places. How long they continued in that first state was according to circumstances. But, whenever things were found

to be in a proper situation, then the Apostle, or some of the Evangelists, his assistants, went and ordained some of the elders, or first converts, to be *Bishops*, and others to be *Deacons*." And so Whitby observes, that the Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, Evangelists, who were all extraordinary offices, are reckoned among those whom God had settled in the church, 1 Cor. 12, 24., and Christ ascending up on high, had given for the edification of his body. Eph. 4, 11, 12. "Some of these Prophets and Teachers (continues he) were in most churches, as at Antioch (Acts 13, 1.) and officiated in them (ver. 3.) at Rom. (12, 6 & 7.), at Corinth (1 Cor. 14.) and at Galatia. (See note on 6, 1.) Some of them were *itinerants*, sent by the Apostles, or *Prophets*, to teach other churches, and by the holy spirit separated to that work (Acts 13, 2, 3 & 4.). Exhorting and confirming the churches where they came, as being *Prophets* authorized so to do (Acts 16, 12.), and travelling up and down for the converting and establishing of the Gentiles (3 Joh. 7 & 8. See note on 1 Cor. 12, 28.). Of one of these two kinds of *Prophets* and *Teachers*, and *spiritual men*, the Apostle may here be understood." It is impossible for me to enter into so extensive a question *here*; but it seems highly probable that among these *Episcopi* one was appointed to *preside*, with the sole power of ordination and *supreme* government, so as to be what we call a *Bishop*. Which brings it to the same thing (though by a different way) as what the Commentators above mentioned contend for. See the note on Phil. 1, 1.

13. καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ ἐκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. This does not simply signify "love them;" as many explain. It answers to the Classical phrase *περὶ πλείονος ἡγεῖσθαι*, or *ποιεῖσθαι*, *make much of*, *hold in honour*. Yet something more is meant: and I cannot but consider the clause as consisting of two blended into one, and I would render it, "make much of, respect and love them." Which, of course, includes providing for their honourable sustenance; and this seems to be suggested by the *διὰ τὸ ἔργον*. Though even the *honouring* might include it. Thus (as Koppe remarks) at 1 Tim. 5, 17. we have *τιμᾶν τὸν προεστῶτα*, which plainly signifies, "provide him with sustenance." See also Matt. 15, 4. The *ἔργον* denotes the *work* and *office*, whether of instruction, or of government, which they exercise.

13. εἰργνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. The reading *αὐτοῖς*, *the rulers*, though very specious, can by no means be admitted, and seems to have arisen from *emendation*. The common reading yields the most extensive, and

therefore the best sense (for it includes the other) ; yet, I think, the words are usually too much *limited* in the explanation, as we had here only an admonition to the congregation at large. “ For (says Benson, from Est.) if the people quarrel among themselves, their Pastors cannot have much esteem, nor do much good.” Which is very true : but not, I think, *the* truth meant by the Apostle. The admonition was (I conceive) intended both for the rulers and the congregation, on whom it especially enjoined the cultivation of peace and concord, namely, by making mutual sacrifices for that purpose, or, as the Apostle says at Eph. 4, 3. ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ· σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδεδσμῷ τῆς εἰρήνης.

14. παρκαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, νουθετεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους. The Apostle (as usual) after the *general* precepts, subjoins such as are most suitable to those times and places.

On the *persons* here addressed the Commentators are not agreed. The antients and some moderns, as Est., Zanch, and Benson, think the *spiritual rulers*. Others, the *people only*. (See Doddr.) But this, from the nature of the expressions, seems very improbable. The *former* opinion is undoubtedly the best founded ; but we may very well suppose *both* to be meant ; though *chiefly* the spiritual rulers. The same word ἀδελφοί being used, as at ver. 12., when addressing the people, will prove nothing ; since the Apostle so perpetually varies his phraseology. Besides, the term νουθετεῖτε, (the same as that used in the preceding verse of the rulers,) shows that they are chiefly had in view. Moreover, the μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας seems especially appropriate to *ministers* ; since, in order to preserve peace with their congregations, such must often exercise this μακροθυμία. And the *spiritual consolation* and *support* may, indeed, be administered to the faint-hearted and weak by *others* as well as the ministers ; though surely by them most efficaciously. And (as Benson

observes) the instructions or admonitions given by parents to their children, or by private Christians to one another, are not inconsistent with those given by ministers to the body of the Christian people."

Νουθετ. imports such reproof and admonition as is calculated to recal any one to a right hand, and produce reformation; as Acts 20, 31. Rom. 15, 11. 1 Cor. 14, 14., where see the notes. This implies that it shall not be intemperate or harsh, but in the spirit of brotherly kindness. So 2 Thess. 3, 16. νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. And so the Psalmist: "Let not their precious balms break my head." On the term νουθ. see the learned note of Krebs.

Ἀτακτοὺς, *unruly, disorderly*. A term properly used of military and political subordination, but of *general* application; as will appear from Wetstein's numerous examples. It here has reference to *spiritual* subordination, and also (as Benson thinks) being idle, neglecting their own proper business, being burthensome to others, and meddling with affairs which did not belong to them. See 1 Tim. 5, 13. 1 Thess. 4, 11 & 12., and more especially 2 Thess. 3, 6—12.

Ὀλιγοψύχους, *the faint-hearted, pusillanimous*, μικρόψυχοι, as opposed to μεγαλψ. The term often occurs in the Sept. It here signifies those who are labouring under, and ready to sink under calamity. By the ἀσθ. are meant the weak in the faith, scrupulous in some respects, and wavering in others; as Rom. 14, 1. τὸν ἀσθενούντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε. See also 14, 15. 1 Cor. 8, 7. The term ἀντέχεσθαι signifies, properly, "to hold up by sustaining with the hand;" but is often used metaphorically. By the πάντας Benson understands *all men*, both Christians and those not so; as 3, 12., and the next verse. And this is confirmed by Theodoret and Œcumen. Benson remarks on the necessity for this patience and long-suffering in Pastors; since the prejudices of some, the stupidity of others, and the infirmities of all, call for tenderness and great patience."

15—28. It is observed, by Benson, that “the practical directions here given are some of them suited only to a church which had the *χαρίσματα*, or spiritual gifts; the others suited to *all Christians*.” Compare Rom. 12, 17—19.

15. *ὁρᾶτε μὴ τις κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινι ἀποδῶ*, “See, mind,” &c. It is plain that this address is not confined to the rulers, but meant for the people at large, i. e. both the classes above addressed, the *pastor* and the *people*. On the subject of *retaliation* I would refer to Max. Tyr. Diss. εἰ τὸν ἀδικήσαντα ἀνταδικητέον. I would also compare Thucyd. 1, 498, 3. Bekk, where, among other traits of the Athenians, is the following: *ἀντιμωρήσασθαί τε τινα περὶ πλείονος ἢν ἢ αὐτὸν μὴ προπαθεῖν* and Soph. Œd. c. 230. *οὐδενὶ μοιριδίᾳ τίσις ἔρχεται ὧν προσπάθῃ τὸ τίνειν ἀπάτα δ’ ἀπάταις ἑτέραις ἑτέρα παραβαλλόμενα πόνον οὐ χάριν ἀντιδίδωσιν ἔχειν*.

Διώκετε τὸ ἀγαθόν, “*pursue, aim at, study to do*.” This is a stronger term than *ποιεῖν*. With respect to the *ἀγαθόν*, it is not to be taken with any philosophical refinements, or in the theological sense *holiness*, but merely in a popular one, as signifying *kindness*, &c., in opposition to evil of any kind. By the *πάντας* must be understood men universally, non-Christians as well as Christians, who are meant by the *ἀλλήλους*.

16. *πάντοτε χαίρετε*. It is strange that many learned Commentators (as Koppe and Rosenm.) should recognize in these words no more than a sort of good bye! “may you ever be prosperous and happy.” And that the judicious Doddr. should think this *may* be the sense I am surprised. Nothing more frigid, low, and creeping was ever devised by those who labour under the *cacoethes innovandi*. The words are, as the Prince of Interpreters has shown, closely connected with the words preceding. Thus, after tracing the connexion, he observes (p. 212, 15.): *ὅταν γὰρ τοιαύτην ἔχωμεν ψυχὴν, ὥστε μηδένα ἀμύνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εὐεργετεῖν, πόθεν, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ τῆς λύπης κέντρον παρεισελθεῖν δυνήσεται; ὁ*

γὰρ οὕτω χαίρων τῷ παθεῖν κακῶς, ὡς καὶ εὐεργεσίαις ἀμύνεσθαι τὸν πεπονηκότα κακῶς, πόθεν δυνήσεται ἀνιρθῆναι λοιπόν; καὶ πῶς οἶόν τε τοῦτο, φησιν; ἂν ἐθέλωμεν, δυνατόν. And so all the best Commentators since his time. It is plain that in those conflicts which the *competitions* of the world perpetually bring upon us, there is especially put to the proof our Christian fortitude in bearing adversity, (Compare 12, 12. and 2 Cor. 6, 10.); since on the *event* of these competitions worldly prosperity and adversity must necessarily depend. On the rejoicing in adversity see Benson, and compare his references; though, I think, the Doctor might have spared the information, which few can be supposed to need, “that we are *not* to rejoice or give thanks for our own sins, or the sins of other men.”

17, 11. ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε. The modern Commentators here recognize no connexion: though it was, I think, correctly traced by Chrys., who observes that this shows the *mode* by which we may attain unto the last mentioned grace. For, as Theophyl. observes (from Chrys.), he who is accustomed to hold converse with God, and render thanks to Him for every thing, (as happening for his good,) will, it is evident, feel perpetual joy.

The ἀδιαλείπτως is usually regarded as an hyperbole, and interpreted of praying at all the set times of prayer. So Whitby. But this seems too formal. The expression rather signifies, “without any intermission of the *habit* of prayer, either at those set times which a conformity with external decorum may enjoin, or a regard to our individual wants, or the peculiarity of circumstances, whether of prosperity or adversity, may require. Compare Eph. 6, 18. and Col. 1, 3.* As to precepts concerning

* Benson, indeed, observes, “that it is unquestionably right to observe the Lord’s day every week, as the stated season for public worship, and particularly for prayer; to be frequently sending up pious breathings and holy ejaculations; to continue instant in prayer, though we should not receive an answer immediately; and

prayer, it were needless to adduce them. See Locke's Common Place Book.

The ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε seems to be explanatory of the preceding. At ἐν παντὶ must be supplied χρόνῳ, τόπῳ, πράγματι, &c., "in all places and circumstances." So Whitby, "for sparing and preventing, for common and extraordinary, general and special, past and present, temporal and spiritual mercies; not only for prosperous and grateful, but also for afflicting providences, for chastisements and "reasonable corrections." Thus (we may conclude) all things will work for our good in the end, serving to make us holy here and happy hereafter."

18. τοῦτο γὰρ θέλημα Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. εἰς ὑμᾶς. Here we have (I think) a *popular* form of expression, importing, "for this is the will of God (signified by Jesus Christ) in regard to you; this is what God is pleased to order by Jesus Christ to be performed by you." The τοῦτο regards both the χαίρετε and the προσεύχεσθε, considered as forming one maxim. See the note on ver. 16.

19—22. These verses are regarded by Koppe as forming an independent portion, and having respect to the προφητεία and the other spiritual χαρίσματα not unfrequently granted to the *Thessalonians* also; as appears from 1, 5. 4, 8. &c. The antient Commentators unite in taking τὸ πνεῦμα for τὸ χάρισμα; and some, as Œcumen., take the expression τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε of suppressing the *exercise* of those gifts by turning away from and disallowing them. And so several moderns, as Whitby. But this seems harsh. Others, as Chrys. and Theoph., and most moderns (as Grot.) understand it of quenching

more especially to be careful always to preserve an habitual frame of mind, suited to the performance of this duty of prayer. But none of these are here enjoined." It is scarcely possible to lay down a position more at variance with truth than this; as if *family* prayer alone were here intended! The Doctor's remarks, however, on the exercise of this highly important duty are deserving of attentive perusal. See also the note of Dr. Gloucester Ridley ap. D'Oyley.

or not supporting them in *themselves*, namely, by neglecting to use them, or by not using them aright. It is observed by Grot., that these gifts being originally imparted in the form of *fire*, are therefore aptly compared to it, and are very properly said to be *quenched*; as here ;* or to be *stirred up*; as 2 Thess. 1, 6. See also 4, 12. There is here, as Benson rightly remarks, *only* an *allusion* to the first method of imparting them; since, in the case of the Thessalonians and others, the gifts were not imparted by an immediate effusion from heaven. As to *how* they might be quenched, he observes, that pride, idleness, neglecting to make use of their spiritual gifts and miraculous powers, or attempting to make a wrong use of them, and all vice in general, tended thereto; but particularly apostacy from the Christian religion. The spiritual gifts (continues he), like the fire upon the altar, could be kindled only from heaven; but might be stirred up, fed with fuel, or quenched by men. On the other hand, reading the Scriptures, fervent, frequent prayer, an orderly and diligent use of their gifts and powers, to the conversion, instruction, or edification of others, joined with an holy life, was the way to stir or blow up the sacred fire, to preserve, and (if God saw proper) to increase in them the miraculous gifts." To the objections of those who suppose that all those particulars relate to the duties of Christians in general, maintaining that otherwise these two verses would be a neglect of method, and a starting from the subject, he has well replied. "It is (says he) no more a starting from the subject than 1 Cor. 13. The Apostle wrote solely to the Thessalonians, and had their circumstances in view. Other churches or persons

* Wets. has several examples of the phrase πνεῦμα σβεννύναι. But few are apposite; most of them signifying merely the dropping or lowering of a wind; others, the quenching of the spirit or life, like a lamp for want of oil, or by the excess of it. The only apposite one is Plut. Pyth. 402 B. τοῦ πνεύματος παντάπασιν ἀπεσβεσμένου καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐκλελοιπυίας.

are to apply those particulars to themselves as far as their circumstances are similar, and no further." All this is very true ; and yet the admonition may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to those influences of the spirit which were in after times given to every man to profit withal.

Most recent Foreign Commentators, as Noesselt and Rosenm., explain away the sense of *πνεῦμα*.

20. *προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε*. This seems to me to be meant as a direction not to quench the Spirit in others : for *προφητεία*, being one of the principal of the gifts, seems to be put for *all* of them generally. As to the sense of the term here, on that I need not enlarge, since it is the same as at 1 Cor. 12—14. where I have fully discussed its meaning. Those celebrated chapters on the supernatural gifts are well said by Benson to be a full comment upon this brief direction. See also Phil. 1, 1—16. Eph. 4, 1—11. Rom. 12, 3—6. Koppe very well annotates thus : " Admonitio scripta iis, qui, ut ipsi singulari hujusmodi spiritus divini afflatu destituebantur, omniaque ex deliberandi et cogitandi subtilitate metiebantur, ita alios divinæ religionis veritatem magis sentiendo quam tranquillè ratiocinando intelligentes contemnere, irridere, Fanaticorum nomine contumeliosè appellare non verebantur."

21. *πάντα δοκιμάζετε τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε*. Griesb. introduces a *δὲ* after the *πάντα*, on the authority of several MSS. and some Fathers (for *Versions* are here no evidence). But nothing can be more uncritical ; since for its *insertion* we can easily account* (especially as most of the MSS. are such as have been systematically altered), but not for its *omission*, especially in so very many MSS. As to the reading *δοκιμάζοντες*, which is supported by several MSS., Editions, Fathers, and the Syriac Version, and is approved by Benson, it is plainly *ex emendatione*, and

* Namely, from a wish to shew its connection with the preceding.

was meant to show that the πάντα—κατέχετε are not separate directions, but closely connected. In short the common reading is sufficiently defended by the *asyndeton*, which is evidently aimed at throughout the whole passage. I would point : πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.

The antient and all the best modern Commentators are agreed that the πάντα must not be taken *generally* (as it is done by some injudicious Commentators, nay, even Vorst., who understood it of *opinions*, as if δόγματα were to be supplied; which would be a most arbitrary ellipsis), but be restricted to the preceding, i. e. all that is said by those *called* Prophets concerning the exercise of the spiritual gifts. So Theophyl. explains : καὶ τὰ ψευδῆ, καὶ τὰ ἀληθῆ μετὰ δοκιμασίας κρίνετε, καὶ τότε τὸ δόξαν ὑμῖν καλὸν, τουτέστι, τὰς ἀληθεῖς προφητείας, κατέχετε, τουτέστι, τιμᾶτε, διὰ φροντίδος ποιείσθε. And Theodoret : ῥᾶδιον ὑμῖν διαγινῶναι, τινὰ μὲν τὰ τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος, τινὰ δὲ τὰ τοῦ ἐναντίου· τὰ τῆς ἀπατῆς τοίνυν ἀποκρίναντες, τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας κατέχετε. This (as Grot. and the best modern Commentators are agreed) relates to the διακρίσεις τῶν πνεύματων mentioned at 1 Cor. 12, 10. and 14, 29. where see the note. And so 1 Joh. 4, 1. δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα. For it appears (as Koppe observes,) that some persons, pretending to have the gifts of the Spirit, infected others with the contagion of error, and perhaps vice. Hence they were to be tried whether they spoke from the Holy Spirit, or from the motions of fanaticism.* At the

* This subject, of the infection of error and fanaticism, is indeed a curious and important one, and might furnish matter for a copious Essay. It may suffice for me to refer to Bp. Warburton on the Holy Spirit, p. 148. 12mo. and to Gesner, Isagog. vol. I. p. 505. where he says : “ Est vera contagio, quæ corripit interdum humanum genus.” And again : “ Est contagio quædam etiam opinio-num, ut qui avertere volunt alios ab sententiâ, ipsi incipiant illi se dare.” Of the truth of these remarks the records of Ecclesiastical History (see Mosheim and Jortin) supply abundant melancholy proofs; and of the latter of them the *Journals* of Whitfield and Wesley furnish many examples which strikingly illustrate the frailty

same time this maxim *may*, doubtless, and with advantage, admit of a general application. And it is excellently remarked by Whitby, that the Apostle does not here bid the Guides of the Church try all things, and the people hold fast that which they delivered to them; but gives an injunction common to all Christians having their senses exercised to discern between good and evil, to all who are obliged to hold fast that which is good, and not to believe *false Prophets*; which is a strong argument for the perspicuity and the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for this work, and against the necessity of a living judge; for he that must try all things, must also try the doctrine of this living judge; and therefore, till he has made this trial, must not admit his doctrine as an article of the Christian Faith, for these words plainly teach that, "what we hold fast must be first tried." That the antient Fathers allowed this δοκιμασία to the hearers of the Gospel preached, nay, even exhorted them to the exercise of it, is proved by the numerous citations from them here adduced by Whitby. How different from the spirit and practice of that Church which pretends so much veneration for the Fathers! Yet let *us* show that we can hold out *religious* as well as *political* toleration to those unlettered and rash brethren who evince little of the *spirit*, and indeed hold little of the *language* of toleration towards ourselves!

Wets. here compares Aristot. M. Moral. 1, 22.

of human nature, and the weakness of the human understanding. Hence the danger of colloquial disputations with fanatics, by which instances are frequent of well meaning persons being *converted* to those very fanatical tenets they meant to *confute*. This brings to my mind a most admirable epigram of the learned Dr. W. Alabaster, which to many of my readers (to nearly all of whom it is perhaps unknown) will, I am sure, be not unacceptable. "Bella inter geminos plusquam civilia fratres Traxerat ambiguus Religionis apex. Ille Reformatæ Fidei pro partibus instat; Iste reformandum denegat esse fidem. Propositis causæ rationibus, alterutrinque Concurrere pares, et cecidere pares. Quod fuit in votis, fratrem capit alter uterque; Quod fuit in fatis, perdit uterque fidem."

where speaking of reason, he says: ὧ δοκιμάζοντες τὸ καλὸν αἰροῦνται. To which I add Marc. Anton. 3, 6. ἀπλῶς καὶ ἐλευθερίως ἐλοῦ τὸ κρεῖττον καὶ τούτου ἀντέχου. With respect to the metaphor in δοκιμ., it is by some thought to be derived from the trying of metals. See the note on Rom. 2, 18. But though this may sometimes have place, yet it has not (I think) *here*. I rather assent to the Fathers, that it is a metaphor derived from money-changers, to whom coin is offered, and who, after trying (by ringing, weighing, the fire, or the touch-stone,) refuse and reject the bad, and κατέχουσι, *take, keep, retain* the good.

22. ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε. The interpretation of this verse depends upon the sense to be assigned to εἶδους, which the usus loquendi will permit either to be interpreted *appearances*, or *kind, sort*. The *former* signification is adopted by nearly all our English Translators, and also Grot., Est., Ranch, Drusc., Pisc., Menoch., Calvin, Doddr., and most moderns. And Drus. compares a saying of the Rabbins: "Remove te procul a turpitudine, et ab omni eo quod speciem ejus habet." The above Commentators, too, refer to various passages forbidding whatever may give scandal. Though they omit what is most apposite, Rom. 12, 17. προνοοῦμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων. But this is quite unsupported by the context, and is (as the best Critics are agreed) scarcely permitted by the propriety of language. On the contrary, *both* these circumstances are in favour of the *latter* interpretation, adopted by the antients (including the Syr., Arab., and Æthiop. Translators), and many eminent moderns, as Hamm., Le Clerc, J. Buxtorf, Wets.,*

* Who thus annotates: "Species duo significat, et id quod verè est atque subsistit, ut cùm temperantiam virtutis speciem dicimus: et id quàm veram existentiam non habet, et, ut loquantur philosophi, τὸ μὴ ὂν, φαινόμενον δὲ, ut cùm speciem dominationis Claudio Imperatori tribuimus, vim imperii Claudii libertis. Paulus priore notione hìc accipit, non posteriore: nam τῷ καλῷ comm. 21. opponitur quod verè malum est: et τῇ ὁλοκληρίᾳ comm. 23. opponitur vel unus levisque defectus."

Benson, Koppe, Schleus., and almost all recent Commentators, namely, *kind, sort*. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): *μη τούτου, ἢ ἐκείνου, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς παντός, καὶ προφῆτου ψευδοῦς, καὶ ἀμαρτήματος*. How agreeable this is to the context is shown by Wets., and how strongly supported by the *usus loquendi* is apparent from his numerous Classical citations, of which the most apposite are the following. Joseph. Ant. 10, 3, 1. *πάν εἶδος πονηρίας ἐπιδειξάμενος ἐν τῷ τροπῷ, καὶ μηδὲν ἀσεβές παραλιπών*. Liban. Or. 688 B. *μη ἀρκοῦντος οὐδενὸς διὰ παντός εἰδους χρηστῶν τε καὶ πονηρῶν ἔργων, ἢ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἢ κακῶς*.

It must be observed that *πονηροῦ* is for τοῦ πονηροῦ, and that for *πονηρίας*; as Rom. 12, 9. *ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν*.

23. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς.

It is well observed by Theophyl. (from Chrys.): *Μετὰ τὴν παραίρεσιν, καὶ εὐχὴν ἐπάγει, ἵνα καὶ ἀμφοτέρωθεν τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἔχωσιν*. The expression ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης is introduced with a reference to that *peace* inculcated at ver. 13., and the violation of which was contemplated in the directions respecting Spiritual gifts. “Thus (observes Benson) at 2 Cor. 13, 11. after recommending peace, he calls God the God of peace; and at Rom. 15, 4 and 5., having mentioned patience and consolation, he styles him the God of peace and consolation; and at Rom. 12, 13., having mentioned trust and hope in God, he calls him the God of hope.” Yet I cannot but include in *εἰρήνη* a notion of the *favour* and *grace* vouchsafed to those who cultivate that peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Ἀγιάσαι. This term, like the Hebr. *וַיַּקְדִּשׁ*, properly signifies to separate, remove from common use, and is often in the Old Test. used of the Levitical offerings; but in the New Testament it frequently signifies (as here) to make any one holy, pure, and virtuous, and keep them so. Thus it is used especially of *God*, or the *Holy Spirit*; as in 1 Cor. 6, 11. *ἡγιασθῆτε*, and Apoc. 22, 11. But the most apposite passage is Joh. 17, 17. (said of God) *ἡγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*, where see the note.

With respect to the *ὁλοτελεῖς*, Koppe would join *ἀγιάσαι ὁλοτελεῖς* (for *ἀγίους ποιεῖσαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὁλοτελεῖς*), and take *ὁλοτ.* for *ἀμώμους, ἀμέμπτους, ἀγίους*, &c. But this is doing violence to the construction, and deteriorating the sense. I see no reason to abandon the opinion of all the antients, and nearly all the moderns, that *ὁλοτελεῖς* is put for *ὁλοτελῶς*, which occurs in Deut. 13, 17. (Aquila.) The term signifies (as Theophyl. says) “both in body and in spirit.”

The *ὀλόκληρον* (of which term Wets. adduces examples in superfluous abundance) plainly, like the *ὁλοτ.* just before, means little

more than *ἄλογον*. But though it agrees grammatically with *πνεῦμα* and *σῶμα*, yet it must also refer to *ἡ ψυχή*. Many learned modern Commentators (as Hamm., Whitby, and Benson) here maintain, that the Apostle by distinguishing the *τὸ πνεῦμα*, the *ἡ ψυχή*, and *τὸ σῶμα*, meant to advert to the opinion of the Philosophers, who represented man as consisting of three parts, spirit, soul, and body. Thus Benson observes: "*The spirit they used sometimes to call the mind, or the intellectual or governing part; and describe it as the seat of the understanding, or reason; or the rational soul; ψυχή was the sensitive soul, the seat of the lower faculties, or of the passions, appetites, and affections. The body was with them the mansion, in which both the rational and sensitive soul resided.*" And Vitringa has shown that the *Rabbins*, as well as the Heathen Philosophers, held that a man's person was constituted of three distinct substances, the *rational spirit*; the *animal soul*; and the *visible body*. I cannot enter further into the subject, but must refer my readers to the very learned notes of Hamm., Whitby, Mackn., Schoettg., and Koppe. It is thought by Benson, that the Thessalonians had been used to that way of distinguishing a man into three parts, of body, soul, and spirit. And the Apostle chose (as the Scriptures generally do) to speak in the popular style, and did not go to set them right in philosophy. His only aim was to teach them the true religion. And here, in a phrase to which they had been accustomed, he heartily prays that they might all be thoroughly sanctified, of how many constituent parts soever they consisted." But there is something in this principle of *accommodation* that I can seldom entirely approve. I cannot think that the Apostle would introduce *Rabbinical* notions in this Epistle, addressed as it is to the *Greeks*: still less that he would chuse to adopt any of the fancies of the *Philosophers*. Not to say that this would be inconsistent with the rest of Scripture, where man is represented as consisting of two parts only, the soul and the body: and indeed none appear ever to have thought otherwise but a few wild and visionary philosophers. In short the Apostle is speaking *ad populum*; and therefore he cannot be supposed to advert to any such subtleties. Nor can I but commend the good sense of Koppe and Rosenm., in seeing that we are only to attend to the popular use by which *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* denoted the mind, feelings, affections, &c. So Koppe: "*De hoc dubitari non debet, omnem istam hominis partitionem in πνεῦμα, ψυχήν et σῶμα non esse ad subtilitatem metaphysicam revocandam, quasi totidem humanæ naturæ partes constituere Apostolus, h. 1. voluisset, sed ex legibus orationis cujusque vehementioris, in quâ solemus, quæ sunt in re quodammodo diversa, invicem ea cumulare ut totam rem exauriamus interpretandam.*" At the same time I see nothing to *disapprove* of in the opinion of Bp. Hall ap. D'Oyley and many others who take the *πν.* to denote the *understanding*; the *ψυχή*, the *affections*; and *σῶμα* the *body*. Which is supported by Greg. Nyssen. ap. Theophyl. *πνεῦμα μὲν εἰπὼν ὁ ἀπόστολος, τὸ νοερὸν μέρος ἐδήλωσε· ψυχήν δὲ, τὸ αἰσθητικόν, σῶμα δὲ, τὴν φυσικὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ζωήν.* "Thus (to use the words of Benson) the Apostle prays that their

understandings might be illuminated with the knowledge of the truth ; their sensitive part, or *affections*, be obedient to their enlightened understandings ; and that the members of their bodies, or their *external actions*, also, might be conformed to the will of God, or obedient to their illuminated minds. And certainly (as Benson observes) if these things were so, verily there would be nothing wanting to a perfect sanctification." But this seems to be too hypothetical ; and I am not certain whether, after all, that be not the true interpretation which was maintained by Chrys. and almost all the antients (see the note of Grot.), and, of the moderns, has been adopted by Grot., Zanch, Wolf, Schmid, Sthoettg., Flacius, Barthius, and others ap. Wolf, who by the *πνεῦμα* understand the *χαρίσματα*, or gifts of the Holy Spirit. And considering that the Apostle has just been treating of these gifts, their exercise, and regulation, it seems not improbable that he here alludes to the same ; speaking of the spiritual gift as if it were *another mind*, or *soul*, See Grot.

24. πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει. The ὁ καλῶν, Koppe and Rosenm. say, is for ὁ καλέσας, by a Hebraism. But καλῶν may be the participle imperfect. The phrase πιστὸς ὁ Θεός is frequent in the Apostle. Πιστὸς signifies *verax*, true to his promises. At καὶ ποιήσει there is a popular brachylogia for, "who will do as he hath promised, will not be wanting on his part." For (as Whitby observes) "if the fidelity of God required that he should sanctify and preserve us blameless to the end, without our care and industry, should work in us absolutely and certainly that care, and the Apostle believed this, how could he fear lest the Thessalonians should be so overcome by Satan's temptations, as that his labour with them might have been in vain, 1 Thess. 3, 5. this being in effect to fear that God might be unfaithful to his promise."

25—27. Beza, Benson, and Koppe think these verses are especially intended for those to whom the Epistle should *first* be delivered, namely, the *προεστώτες*, or Presbyters. But this rests on mere supposition, and moreover does injustice to the humility of the Apostle, who here, as in many other places, desires the prayers of those to whom he writes ; (meaning thus to lead them to pray for each other and for

themselves). For the *ἑμῶν* would seem (as Koppe thinks) to be meant for *himself* only.

On the *ἀσπάσασθε* see the note on Rom. 16, 16. The *ἅγιον*, Koppe thinks, is meant to indicate, that *Christians* only were to be thus saluted. And this, indeed, is evident from *ἀδελφοὶ* and *ἀδελφοὺς*. It plainly means (as Zanch explains) that the salutation shall be pure, sincere, &c., as opposed to libidinous, insincere, and hypocritical salutations.

27. *ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Κύριον*. There is here an ellipsis of *νῆ*, or the like. *Ὁρκίζειν* properly signifies to *put any one to his oath*, *עֲשֵׂה בְּרִית*, to make him swear. See Mark 5, 7. and Acts 19, 13. and the notes, and especially the note on Matt. 26, 63. On the *mode* see Whitby.* *Ἀναγνώσθηναί, to be read, or recited aloud*. This direction at least must be meant for the Presbyters. It is of importance to observe that this and the Epistle to the Colossians being desired to be read in the churches, seems to show that the Apostle intended *all* for that purpose. See Benson. Koppe thinks it plain, from this passage, that the Apostle had then already written *more* Epistles meant for the Presbyters *only*, or at least that he had come to know that the Presbyters had kept to themselves letters meant to be read before all, only reading what seemed useful to the people. (So Theodoret: *εἰκὸς γὰρ ἦν τοὺς πρῶτους τῇ ἐπιστολῇ δεξαμένους μὴ*

* Benson has here the following instructive annotation: "There were two ways of taking an oath; both of which by the Jewish canons were reckoned binding. 1. When a man swore by his own mouth, or pronounced the oath himself. 2. When he was adjured by the mouth of another, and that other pronounced the oath, and thereby laid him under the obligation of it. (See Ainsworth on Lev. 5, 1. and Whitby in loc.) In all cases, an execration or curse is supposed to attend an oath; to which the person who takes the oath is exposed, if he swears falsely. See Josh. 6, 26. 1 Sam. 14, 24. Kings 2, 23. When a person was adjured, he was bound by an oath, and it is lawful to answer to such an oath, as appears by our Saviour's answering the high priest, when he adjured him by the living God, Matt. 26, 63. and that other solemn oaths are lawful, see on James 5, 12."

πάσι ταύτην προσεγγεῖν. Edit.) For unless one or the other had happened, why should the Apostle have thought of thus adjuring them? This, however, seems very hypothetical and precarious; and if it be true (as many eminent Commentators say) that this was the first Epistle which St. Paul wrote as an Apostle, it must fall to the ground.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

CHAP. I.

This Epistle may be regarded as a supplement to the former. The main point about which he wrote this second Epistle was, to rectify a mistake into which they had fallen, concerning the speedy coming of Christ; a mistake which, if not rectified, might have proved of dangerous consequence. But he has also added other things of considerable importance, comforting the Thessalonians under their persecutions, and reprehending the idle and disorderly among them. (Benson.)

VERSE 1, 2. See the note on 1 Thess. 1, 1. The words *χάρις*—*Χριστοῦ* are thus paraphrased by Benson: "May favour be granted unto you, and all happiness, from God our Father, the fountain of all good; and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator through whom God communicates his favours to mankind!"

3. In ver. 3—12 the Apostle commends them for steadfastness of their faith, and for their patience under persecution: assuring them that when Christ comes to judgment, they should be rewarded, and their persecutors punished. (Benson.)

3. *εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν—ἄξιόν ἐστι.* Compare Rom. 1, 8. 1 Cor. 1, 4 and 5. Phil. 1, 3 and 4. *Εὐχαριστεῖν* is for *χάριν ἔχειν*, or *εἰδέναι*. The term rarely occurs in the Classical writers; though Koppe refers for an example to Phalar. p. 96. Oxon. *οὐκ εὐχαριστήσομεν τῷ Θεῷ*. Yet this would seem to be an imita-

tion of this *Pseudo-Phalaris*. It is often used by Josephus, and sometimes by Philo. See Loesn. on Rom. 1, 8. The plural *we* is (as Koppe observes) here, and throughout this Epistle (as in the former) to be interpreted of Paul *only*. And ὁφείλομεν εὐχ. (he remarks) is to be taken *populariter* for αἰτίαν ἔχω τοῦ εὐχαριστεῖν. Wets. however, compares Xen. Cyr. 3. οὐδεμίαν αὐτῷ χάριν ὁφείλομεν. On the πάντοτε, which is to be taken as at 1 Thess. 5, 16., see the note on 1 Thess. 5, 17. Ἄξιον is said by Koppe to be for καθηκόν; as Matt. 3, 8. Acts 26, 20. and Demosth. (cited by Grot.): ἄξιον ἐστὶν σιωπᾶν. And so (I would add) Thucyd. not unfrequently. It is explained by Phot. ap. Œcumen.: δικαῖον ἐστι.

There is an antithesis between ὑπεραυξάνει ἢ πίστις ὑμῶν and πλεονάζει ἢ ἀγάπη, &c. Hence they are considered by Koppe and Rosenm. as synonymous. But surely ὑπεραυξάνειν, which occurs no where else in the New Testament, is the stronger term. So Theophyl. observes, that the Apostle uses it to show τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ ὕψους. I would compare Herodian 3, 6, 18. ὑπερευφραίνετο. Hence we may infer, that their *faith* had increased in a greater degree than their ἀγάπη, which (it must be observed) is not to be confined to *charity*, but (as compared with Gal. 5, 6. 1 Thess. 1, 3. 6, 12. 5, 8.) is (as Koppe observes) to be extended to all those *kind offices* by which Christians might assist Christians, and remove, or at least mitigate, the bitterness of those calamities with which they were called upon to struggle. So πίστις and ἀγάπη are introduced at Eph. 1, 15 & 16. It is observed by Benson, that the great love and mutual affection among the Christians at Thessalonica, tended much to increase the stedfastness of their faith, and their patience under persecution.

4. ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς—αἰς ἀνέχεσθε. The ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς is for ἐμαυτὸν. And καυχᾶσθαι ἐν τινὶ παρ' ἑτεροῦ signifies so to rejoice and exult in the virtue of any one as to propose him for an example to others. Ἐν ὑμῖν, “of you.” Ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, “among

the members of the churches of Christ," i. e. among Christians. (Koppe.) But this seems refining away the sense. It is surely more significant to say he praised them among other *churches*, than among other *Christians*. Thus (as observes Benson) he had, 1 Thess. 1, 9., told them how much other churches spoke of their ready and cheerful reception of the Christian faith at its first entrance among them : here he seems to allude to that, and informs them that the matter was now carried farther ; and that he and his two assistants gloried in them, in other churches, for their patience and stedfastness in the faith, under all their persecutions." And this is supported by the authority of Chrys. and Theophyl.

Here the Apostle follows his usual custom, of introducing commendation, in order to excite to emulation and advancement in the Christian life, well knowing the power of the stimulus *laudari a viro laudato*. He acquaints them how much he gloried in them among other and distant nations, which could not fail to give them pleasure, and excite them more and more to deserve such praise.

I cannot consider ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς as put for ἐμαυτόν. It seems to mean, not only other Christians, but even we Apostles ourselves, or even *I myself*. The ὑπομονή and πίστις are, by the recent Commentators (as Koppe and Rosenm.) treated as synonymous. Others at least regard them as forming an hendiadis. But it seems better to keep them (as do the antients and the early moderns) distinct ; the latter denoting that *principle* by which the former was produced. Ὑπομονή signifies, " your patient endurance of afflictions and persecutions. See Theophyl. on the significancy of the term. Διωγμ. and θλιψ. are likewise regarded as synonymes united for *greater effect*. But it should seem that the *former* has reference to their *persecution from Heathen zealots* ; the latter, to the ill usage of their friends, or the calamities which persons of the working classes (called by Theophyl.

πένητες ἄνθρωποι) would have to encounter from having disobliterated Heathen masters, which would be only another modification of persecution. Theophyl. has here the following apt reflection: αἰσχυνέσθωσαν ὅσοι διὰ προστασίαν ἀνθρώπων εἰς δόγματα στρεβλὰ μετατίθενται.

5. ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.

The sense of this passage is strangely misconceived by some Commentators, partly on account of the construction, which is not a little obscure. It is admitted that *eis* must be supplied, which is, indeed, found in Theophylact's text and the Syriac Version. But a relative and verb substantive must also be supplied: and then the question is, to what antecedent is the relative to be referred? Some, (as the antients,) say to the more remote ὑπομονή; others, as many moderns, to the nearer ταῖς θλίψεσι; which seems preferable. Though perhaps, after all, the *whole sentence* preceding may be the antecedent, and thus the relative be ὅ; q. d. "which endurance of yours, or your having to endure such persecutions and afflictions, will serve for an ἔνδειγμα," &c. But the scope of the passage is (as I have before said) strangely misconceived by some, who understand by the righteous judgment of God his judging righteously by taking the Gentiles into his kingdom. This and other such fancies (which may be seen in the Crit. Sacr., Pole, and Wolf) tend to obscure rather than clear up the sense, the true ratio of which was not amiss seen by the antients, and yet more clearly by the moderns. The true interpretation is (I think) that of Grot., Zanch, Wolf, Whitby, Doddr., Benson, Rosenm., Koppe, Jaspis, and most recent Commentators, namely, "which endurance of persecution and affliction is a proof and evidence of the righteous judgment God will exercise at the last day. So Grot.: "These things are suffered, that God may, at some future time, have an opportunity of showing his justice." And Koppe: "That you are miserable, and your persecuting adversaries happy, supplies a strong argument for another life, and for you a *better* one, but for them a *worse*." "Suppose God (says Benson) to be just, I know no stronger proof of a righteous judgment to come, than the persecutions of good men and the present triumphs of the wicked; no argument of a righteous judgment to come more forcible and striking than this." See his note. It is justly and elegantly observed by Wets.: "Tantum ab est, ut homines pii, si vexationes patientur, incipiant de justitia Dei, quæ bonis mala immittit, dubitare; ut potius probationes atque confirmationes reddantur atque tam certâ spe futuram gloriam præcipiant, quam certò sciunt, se nunc malorum patientiâ defungi." The Apostle (as Chrysost. and Theophyl. well observe) supplies consolation not only by bidding them expect the reward of their persecutions, but the punishment of their persecutors. On which sentiment it were out of place to seek refinements.

At *eis τὸ καταξιοῦναι*—πάσχετε (which is a separate clause) there is another subaudition to be made. The mildest may be this:

“ (Which afflictions are permitted to befall you) in order that ye may be accounted worthy of, and so obtain, the kingdom of God.” For such is (I think) the sense of *καταξ.*, which is a vox prægnans. Koppe merely dwells on the latter part of the sense, and wholly omits the former; which seems unjustifiable. At the same time I see no reason to take occasion from a popular expression like this to seek arguments, one way or the other, on the controverted doctrine of *human merit*. Benson’s note may be consulted: but on this, as well as most other mysteries of the Gospel, his notions are too confined and limited.

6. εἴπερ δίκαιον—θλίψιν. Here εἴπερ has the sense of *siquidem, nam*. Ecumen. says it is put for ἐπεὶ-δηπερ; Chrys., for ἐπεὶ; and he well explains the ratio of this idiom, which also (he observes) carries with it an answer in the affirmative; as we familiarly say, “If God hate the wicked, and care for the righteous, this or that shall be; but he *does* so.” We may, then, render: “If (as is the case) it is just,” &c.

6. δίκαιον παρὰ Θεῷ, “just in the sight of God.” Ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν. This, like many similar words in all languages, is capable both of a good, and a bad sense, on which I need not dilate. Suffice it to say, that by thus introducing a word *capable* of a *good* sense with a word implying *punishment* (as in the Psalm, “*reward* evil to his *adversaries*”), there is something more of point imparted to the other term.

Θλίψις does not properly signify *punishment* (as here); but it is so used for the sake of antithesis. See Rom. 12, 19., and the note.

7. καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν μεθ’ ἡμῶν. The καὶ may be rendered, “and (on the other hand).” Ἄνεσις properly signifies *relaxation*, release from labour or trouble: as 2 Cor. 7, 5.; but, as Koppe remarks, like the Heb. רַחֲמִים, it is, by an image frequent among the Orientals (with whom rest represents happiness), used to denote the felicity promised to God’s faithful servants. See Heb. 3, 11. and 4, 1—11. and the notes. This is, however, not confined to the Orientals. So our Scottish Theocritus:

“And when fatigued with work, or close employment,

“A *blink of rest* ’s a sweet enjoyment!”

7. μεθ’ ἡμῶν, “together with, in common with us.”

2 THESSALONÆ the certainty of the re-

This is meant towards." See Βαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ.—αὐτοῦ. A pas-

7. ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ majesty, of which the foreign Com-
sage ofrs, as usual, seem to exert themselves to
mer the grandeur of the imagery by their minute
explanations ;* not failing to tell us that all is said
ἀνθρωποπαθῶς ; which is surely more than they can
know. In the mean time, it were better to abstain
from all irreverent discussion.

That the subject here is the *final advent* of Christ
to judgment, appears (as Koppe and Rosenm. ob-
serve) from a comparison with 1 Thess. 1, 10. 3, 13.
4, 15. seqq. 5, 2 & 23. ; and therefore to interpret
this, as some do, of Christ's *advent to destroy Jeru-
salem*, seems merely a device resorted to, to avoid
the difficulties at c. 2.

8. ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, ὡς ἡ ψα Ps. 104, 4. πυρ. φλόγον
Is. 4, 5. ἡ πυρὶς φλογὰ or ἐν φλογὶ πυρός ;
and here, indeed, some MSS. have ἐν φλογὶ πυρός
(See Ps. 29, 7., &c.) ; but that is ex emendatione.
(Koppe.) The ratio of the idiom is thus explained
by Grot. : " Idem est πῦρ φλογός ut hic, et φλόξ
πυρός Ps. 29, 7. Eza. 29, 6. Joel 2, 5. Apoc. 9, 12.
quia quod Hebræis vice Genitivi est, id modo sub-
jecti, modo adjuncti, habet significationem." On the
thing signified by the πῦρ φλογός Commentators are
not agreed. The antients and the earlier moderns,
as Est., think that it means the fire of hell, i. e. the
fire of the conflagration which shall usher in the day
of judgment. Theophyl. and others construe the
words with διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν ; q. d. ἐν τῇ γενέσει κολά-
ζοντος τοὺς ἀπειθεῖς ; or with τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
with the subaudition of γενησομένη. Compare Ps.

* Thus they say ἀποκαλύψει is for παρουσία ; since the Heb. הָבִיאוּ
and ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι are sometimes used of simple appearance :
which needs no refutation. They also take ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως
αὐτοῦ for ἀγγέλων δυνάτων (See Benson), which is, however, well
rendered by Rosenm., " qui majestati ejus inserviunt : " and he
rightly observes that δύναμις here, like the Heb. כֹּחַ and עָז, simply
signifies the *Divine majesty*.

96, 3. The *latter* construction. CHAP. I.

Most recent Commentators, from ^{be} more natural, take it to denote the *glory* in which ^{downwards,} be clothed at the great day. Koppe ^{Lord shall} of awful lightning and thunder; which ^{stands it} is consistent with the former. In either case ^{con-} *ἐν μῦσ* taken in the sense *inter*. Hamm. understands it of the Angels; and Grot. sinks it into a sort of rhetorical ornament. Upon the whole, there is no great objection to the interpretations of Benson and Koppe; but I see no sufficient reason to abandon the common one, which is confirmed by the unanimous authority of the antients. The *ἐν* will thus be for *σὺν*. We may compare Virg. *Æn.* 2, 587. *animunque explesse juvabit ultriciis flammæ*, h.e. *ultrici flammâ*; a metaphorical expression for *ultio*, *punishment*. See Wakef. on Eurip. *Ion.* 1281.

On the *mode* in which this will take place I dare not venture to offer an opinion. The reader may consult Mackn. who, as often, professes much knowledge of this kind.

Διδόναι ἐκδίκησιν is a sort of Hebraism for *ποιεῖσθαι ἐκδ.*, and is said *ἀνθρωποταθῶς*. *Τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεὸν—Χριστοῦ*. By the former, Benson thinks, are meant the *unbelieving Gentiles*; and by the latter the *unbelieving Jews*. And so Koppe. (See Benson's note.) But this seems too hypothetical, and far too limited. I see no reason to abandon the common opinion, that by *τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεοῦ* are meant all *non-Christians*, of course implying such as have had the *means* of knowing, and have neglected them, and whose ignorance is voluntary (See Rom. 2, 16.); by the latter, those who, after having embraced the Gospel, do not fulfil its injunctions. That two sorts of persons are meant, is plain from the repetition of the article *τοῖς*.

9. *οἵτινες δίκην τίσουσιν*. Koppe explains: "*pœnas injuriarum Christianis illatarum luent.*" And he refers to numerous examples of *τίνειν* with *δίκην*, and similar words. But this is an unwarrantable lowering of the sense. The Apostle is speaking of the

general judgment, and the punishment of *all the wicked*, and not merely those who have persecuted Christians. On the *sentiment* the Rabbinical illustrations may be consulted.

9. ὁλεθρον αἰώνιον, “eternal perdition.” On these words Chrys. has some masterly remarks in opposition to the Origenians, who maintained that the punishment of the wicked would not be eternal. The very nature of the expressive term ὁλεθρος, *perdition*, suggests the idea of utter and irrecoverable ruin and destruction. It is said by the Commentators to be put for κόλασιν. But the truth is, that the two phrases are (as often in St. Paul) blended into one; q. d. “they shall suffer eternal punishment, even utter perdition.” It may be well asked, with Chrys. and Theophyl., how αἰώνιος ever can mean πρόσκαιρος? The common device to which the Unitarians and others resort, namely, that of representing the term as meaning no more than *age-lasting*, is only fit for Sciolists, and those who *wish* to be deceived, and merely merits silent contempt. The same may be said of the notable device of Koppe, who takes αἰώνιος for τοῦ αἰῶνος μέλλοντος, as opposed τῇ ἐπιγείῳ, τοῖς παθήμασι τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, Rom. 8, 18. And in a similar manner he would take πῶς αἰώνιον, Matt. 18, 8. and κρίσις αἰων. Mark 3, 29. Nor can I omit to reprobate that of Rosenm., who renders, “only to end with their lives,” referring to Joh. 8, 35. How men of their learning and ability could bring themselves to propound such harsh and frigid interpretations (manifestly devised for the nonce), I cannot conceive; but sure I am that the mischief done, and the responsibility incurred by this spirit of rash innovation is inconceivable, and, if not checked, this mania is calculated to shake the stability of the Gospel itself. On the awful subject in question see the copious Dissertation of Whitby.

Now this *perdition*, it is added, shall be ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου; which words, from their brevity, are somewhat obscure, and have been variously in-

terpreted. The antients and Zanch think they denote the *facility* with which men will be judged, and hint that the cause of condemnation will be in themselves, as being self-condemned at the *first glance* of the presence of the Lord, and (as Bishop Hopkins says) “blasted by the lightning of his eyes!” But this interpretation, however ingenious, seems very harsh. Scarcely more probable is that of Grot. and others, who take ἀπὸ to signify the *cause*, for ὑπὸ and παρά; q. d. “they shall suffer punishments to be inflicted by the Lord and his divine power.” A sense not a little frigid. And (as Koppe observes) ἀπὸ is never so taken; the passages adduced by Grot. being of another kind. No interpretation bears the stamp of truth but the commonly received one, which is ably supported by Koppe. He remarks (after Grot.) that the words are taken from Is. 2, 10, 19. מַגְנִי פֶהךָ יְהוָה וּמַדְרִיךְ כְּאוֹכִי Gr. ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου Κυρίου καὶ α. τ. δ. τ. ι. α. Τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Κυρίου is for ὁ Κύριος, by a poetical figure. Δόξα and ἰσχὺς, which answers to the Hebr. דָּוָד and יָמָל, are synonymous, and express the *majesty* of the Lord. So Theophyl.: οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δόξης ἰσχύος παρέστι· οὔτε ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἀνίσχυρος, οὔτε ἡ ἰσχὺς ἄδοξος· τουτέστιν, ὡς βασιλεὺς δυνατὸς ὀφθήσεται. The ἀπὸ signifies, “far removed from the Lord and the glorious majesty of his kingdom.” See Gen. 4, 14. And this interpretation is plainly supported by the sense of the passage of Isaiah. That the wicked and reprobate will pass their miserable existence in quite another place from the habitations of the accepted, is the perpetual doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. So Matt. 25, 41. “Depart from me ye wicked into everlasting fire,” &c.

10. ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐνδοξασθῆναι—ἐκείνη. It is observed by Koppe that the members ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ and θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, are altogether parallel, and to be interpreted one from the other. At ἐνδοξ. is to be understood ὥστε. It is, moreover, observed by Koppe, that ἐνδοξασθῆναι

ἐν τινι נכבד or התפאר with ב, is often used in the sense, to give glory or praise for any one's happiness or misery, as being the cause of it. Compare Exod. 14, 4. Ez. 28, 22. Is. 49, 3. Θαυμαζέσθαι ἐν τινι (as Is. 61, 6. Sap. 8, 11.) will be the same. By the τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ and the τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, are denoted the same persons, namely, all those who truly believe and faithfully obey the Gospel. See 1 Thess. 3, 13. The sense is: "when, at that day, he shall come to be glorified in the reward of his faithful disciples, and to be admired in the exaltation of those who have believed in him.*

On the sense of the next words ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη—ἐκείνῃ, Commentators differ. The most favourite interpretation for the last century has been that of Grot., who, following the Syr., takes ἐπιστεύθη in a *future* sense; it being (he says) an aorist signifying a thing which at the time spoken of shall be past. But that is a very precarious principle; and in passages of difficulty the Syriac translator has little weight. Koppe, however (as does also Elsner), adopts this interpretation, and assigns the following as the sense: "certa enim evenient tempore isto, quæcunque vobis de ea re alias jam confirmavimus:" observing, that πιστεύεσθαι is for πιστούσθαι, or πιστὸν εἶναι. But that is a signification which, though oc-

* It is well remarked by Benson, that whilst the saints are despised, insulted, and persecuted, Christ is not glorified in them, nor admired for his regard to them. But, when he shall punish their persecutors, raise his saints from the dead, deliver them out of all their troubles, and make them completely glorious and happy; then shall he be glorious and admirable in the eyes of the whole world. His veracity, power, wisdom, and abundant goodness will then shine out conspicuously. The whole intelligent creation will then esteem him glorious and admirable, for what he has done in and for his faithful disciples. Col. 3, 3 & 4. 1 Joh. 2, 1. &c. with which compare Is. 14, 23. Wisd. 5, 1. &c. So Theophyl. observes, that the Lord's glory in this is theirs, and theirs is His, since he is glorified in the glorifying of his saints. Moreover, when those are brought forward who suffer torments inflicted for the purpose of inducing them to apostatize from the faith, and did not apostatize, then their glory and the Lord's will be shown."

curring in the Classical writes, is rarely found in the Scriptural ones. I see no reason to deviate from the construction and sense of the passage laid down by the antients, and adopted by most modern interpreters, who take ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, as put, per trajectionem, as Rom 2, 12 & 16., and to be united with ὅταν ἔλθῃ; and explained, “the day of judgment;” which sense is confirmed by 2, 2. Benson has rightly seen that at the words ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη—ὕμᾱς must be supplied, “and in you particularly.” This is required by the ὑμᾱς following. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) paraphrases thus: Θαυμασθήσεται ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, διότι τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐπιστεύθη παρ’ ὑμῶν, τουτέστι, διότι ὑμεῖς ἐπιστεύσατε, καὶ ἀξιόους ἑαυτοὺς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκείνων ἐποιήσατε, τῶν τότε διδομένων τοῖς πιστοῖς. The sense may be thus expressed: “because our testimony among you to the truth of the Gospel of Christ had been believed; and the practice suitable thereto observed.”

11. εἰς ὃ καὶ—ἐν δυνάμει. The εἰς ὃ is *not* (as Koppe tells us) a mere particle of transition, but it rather signifies *in order to which*; q. d. “And in order that he may be thus glorified and held out to admiration in you, we constantly offer up prayers for you.” The περὶ is for ὑπὲρ, *in behalf of*; as Luke 4, 38. Joh. 17, 9. Eph. 6, 18. Col. 1, 3.

ἵνα ὑμᾱς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. The words are variously interpreted. The recent Commentators, as Koppe and Rosenm., render simply: “that God would make you partakers of, give you this blessing of eternal felicity promised in the Gospel.* And certainly this must, upon the whole, have been the Apostle’s meaning; yet it is better to keep more close to the words and the literal sense. Schleus. 1, 251. renders thus: “ut vos dignos reddat Christianæ religionis sectatores, vel dignos qui potiamini futurâ Christianorum felicitate.”

* And so Benson, who observes (from Vorst. and Zanch) that κλήσεως is put, by metonymy, for the glory and felicity to which they were called.

But I see not how this sense can be elicited from the words. I prefer the common interpretation, "treat or account you as worthy." The κλησ. does not so much denote the felicity itself as that which leads to it: for I agree with Chrys. and the other antient Commentators (and, of the moderns, Est.), that it signifies what is by Theologians termed *the calling of perseverance*, or *effectual calling*. So Theophyl.: κλήσιν οὖν ἐνταῦθα λέγει, τὴν διὰ τῶν πράξεων βεβαιουμένην, ἥτις καὶ κυρίως κλήσις ἐστίν, ὥσπερ καὶ πίστις κυρίως ἢ ἔμπρακτος.

The words following καὶ πληρώσῃ—δυνάμει, are not a little obscure, and have been variously interpreted. They may be best understood by being taken as explanatory of the preceding (so Theophyl.: ταύτην, φησι, τὴν πλησιν λέγω); and hence we must reject the interpretation of Noesselt and Rosenm., "perficiat virtute (suâ) benevolentiam (vestram) et liberalitatem a fide profectam." The context shows (as Benson observes) that the ἀγαθωσύνης does not relate to their *benevolence to other men*, but *God's goodness to them*. See Matt. 11, 26. Luke 12, 32. Eph. 1, 5 & 9. Is. 53, 10. Besides, the construction of the sentence will not permit that interpretation. Koppe, who minutely discusses the words, acknowledges that both grammatical propriety, and the common usage of language require that εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης (as being a phrase synonymous with χαρίτος) should be referred to *God*; and ἔργον πίστεως be taken of the *effect* of this ἀγαθωσύνη Θεοῦ, and πληροῦν, be variously rendered, according to the diversity of signification in ἀγαθωσύνη and πίστις. He then lays down the construction and sense thus: πληρώσῃ (sc. ἐν ὑμῖν) πασ. εὐδ. ἀγαθ. *summa sud benignitate vos amplectatur* (Schol. Græc. πληρώσῃ πᾶσαν ἀγαθὴν βουλὴν εἰς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός, contra vero πληρώσῃ ἔργον πίστεως, *fidem in vobis sud vi excitatam servet, alat, augeat*. And so Zanch. The whole is very well paraphrased by Benson thus:

“that he would, by his mighty power, carry on and complete all the kind designs of his goodness; and particularly that he would complete your patience under afflictions, as well as every other part of holiness; that great work, which is the proper fruit of your faith.”

12. ὅπως ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἐν ὑμῖν. Koppe takes ἐνδοξ. ἐν τινι as at ver. 10.; and he thinks that καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ is synonymous with ἐνδοξάσθῃ ἐν ὑμῖν just before, only inversely propounded; q. d. “Illa ipsa, quam tum nacturi estis, felicitas, et Christo et vobis laudi erit atque honori.” But this is very harsh and precarious. It has been well observed by Crell., that the Apostle subjoins the *first* cause of the thing wished, and which impelled him to wish and pray.

It has been debated whether the Apostle is speaking of the name of Christ being glorified in them, and they in him in *this world*, or at the *day of judgment*? or *both*? But all these opinions are liable to objection. The best founded interpretation seems to be that of Chrys., Theophyl. and other antients, and which is embraced by Benson, namely, that Christ might be glorified in them in *this* life, and they in him at the *last day*. This, too, is the view taken by Crell. who has sifted the sense of the whole verse with his usual minute diligence.

By the *name* of Christ (as Benson observes) is here, as often, meant his religion and Gospel. See more in Benson.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. Having before mentioned the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Apostle here gently slides into the main design of this Epistle; which was to rectify a mistake that had been spread among the Christians at Thessalonica, either by some weak, or designing persons viz. “That the day of the Lord

was then just at hand." And to procure regard to that assertion, they had insinuated that St. Paul had had it revealed to him; and that he had intimated as much, either by word of mouth, or by epistle. He now assures the Thessalonians, that he had had no such revelation; and that he had neither said, nor designed to insinuate, any such thing. On the contrary, he had formerly told them, and now repeats it, that a grand apostacy was first to happen; and that the man of sin would first appear, and delude many. And, having thus warned them, he hoped that neither this mistake, nor any thing else, would so stagger them as to cause them to throw off Christianity, and endanger their final acceptance with God. (Benson.)

1. ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τ. Κ. ἡ. I cannot think that ὑπὲρ is well rendered by Beza, Pisc., and our English translators, as if it were a formula of solemn adjuration. Greatly preferable is the interpretation of Camer., Hamm., Grot., Vitringa, Doddr., Benson, and almost all recent Commentators, who take it for *παρὰ*, *respecting*, which yields an unexceptionable sense.

1. καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν. The best comment on this passage may be derived from 1 Thess. 4, 16 & 17. where see the note. With respect to τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου, it is by the best Commentators, antient and modern, understood of the *advent of Christ to judgment*. Some indeed take it of his advent to the destruction of Jerusalem; but this cannot well be the sense *here*. See the instructive note of Benson.

2. εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς, μ. θ. The word σαλεύεσθαι signifies properly, to be moved as a wave of the sea, or to be tossed by waves. It is, however, applied to shaking of any kind, both physical and metaphorical. So Arrian Epict. 3, 26. (cited by Wets.), μὴ ἀποσαλεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σοφισμάτων. Here ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς being added, the phrase corresponds to the Latin *mentis statu detur-*

bari: and Koppe thinks it quite synonymous with the *θροεῖσθαι* following. Now the *μήτε θροεῖσθε* may very well be compared with Matt. 24, 6. *ὁράτε μὴ θροεῖσθε*, i. e. *ταρασσασθε*, or *θορυβεῖσθε*. (See Alberti's Gloss. Græc.) But there is no reason to confound both together. The words may be rendered thus: "that ye be not soon shaken from the hitherto settled persuasion of your minds, nor be thrown into unreasonable perturbation." The *ταχέως* seems to be levelled at some who *had* been *soon* thus shaken. They possibly thought (Benson observes) that Christ would come in a few months, weeks, or days. And it was of very great moment to rectify that mistake, lest they should apprehend Christ would never come, or that his religion deserved no regard, when they found that he did not come so speedily as they expected."

2. *μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, μήτε διὰ λόγου, μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς* ὡ. δ. ἡ. The *πνευμ.* is explained by some, as Vatab., Pisc., Vorst., Beza, and Koppe, as denoting one who pretends to a spiritual gift, namely, of prophecy. Most others, both antient and modern, take it to mean a prophecy purporting to be dictated by the spirit. The *λόγου* is understood by Theophyl. of *vivâ voce* instruction. But this seems too formal and harsh. I am inclined to think with Grot. and Koppe, that there is an *hypozeugma*, and that the *λόγου* and *ἐπιστολῆς* are connected, and the *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* is to be referred to both, as *λόγον* and *γράμματα* in Polyb. 4, 24. The former, it should seem, refers to something asserted to have been said by Paul; the second, to a letter purporting to have been written by him. On this passage see the instructive note of Dr. Benson. It is probable from hence that there were then persons guilty of each of the three above mentioned impostures; and the two last, it has been supposed, had already been practised in the case of the Apostle. We have not, indeed, information sufficient to enable us to form any decided opinion; but the carrying, or reporting, pretended

verbal orders, or messages, probably had happened; and as the forging of letters was not uncommon in these corrupt times, the Apostle might have reason to fear it, and therefore provided against it. Indeed we may perceive in the case of all his other Epistles a great caution in this respect; though he no where hints at any probable imposture. I would, moreover, observe, that it is not impossible impositions as to the day of the Lord being near at hand might have been practised by some, from the same mistaken motives as have produced the pious frauds of the Romish church.

3. μή τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ—τρόπον, sub. ὁρᾶτε, “See that no man deceive you by these or by any other means whatsoever.” Ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον. The phraseology is extremely brief; and something must be supplied. Rosenm. proposes the following: “Ὅτι οὐ μὴ παραγίνεται ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμέρα, ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία.”

There is unquestionably no passage in the New Testament that has so much and so vainly exercised the learning and ingenuity of Commentators as this most obscure prediction respecting the ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας the man of sin, to detail and review all the various opinions on which would be beyond the compass of an annotation, and would require a pamphlet of no very slender dimensions. To me it appears to be a prophecy, and as much defying all attempts at any satisfactory determination of its sense as any in the Apocalypse. Such being the case, I shall content myself with detailing and reviewing the principal opinions, referring my readers to Whitby, Benson, Mede, Newton, and Koppe. And, considering the uncertainty of the subject, and the variety of opinions, I cannot attempt to form any regular exegesis.

The various hypotheses that have been hazarded may very well be distributed into two classes; 1. That of those Commentators who interpret the words of something which was *speedily to happen, and did happen*, in the course of a comparatively short period; as, for instance, those who understand them of the *destruction of Jerusalem*, and take the *apostacy* to denote that which Ecclesiastical history informs us did take place before that event, especially among the Jewish Christians, through prejudices in favour of the perpetuity of the Mosaic law, or an expectation of the temporal kingdom of the Messiah, or the fear of persecution. And Vitringa shows that a great apostacy prevailed in the Christian church between the days of Nero and Trajan. Of this, too, Whitby understands it: or the apostacy may (he thinks) mean the *revolt from the Romans*: which,

however, can by no means be admitted; though it has been adopted by Schoettg., who thinks that by *the man of sin* is meant the Pharisees and Rabbins, the instigators to that rebellion. But this latter hypothesis is liable to numerous objections, and the former, though the more probable, cannot be the true opinion, since the strong expressions which follow are inapplicable, or rather inexplicable, on that hypothesis. Nor even does Lightfoot's hypothesis, which unites both the above, seem to be at all more tenable, as one event followed the other. Hammond, with his usual bias towards his favourite hypothesis, explains the ἀποστασία of the defection of the Gnostics, effected by the arts of the heresiarch Simon Magus, whom he supposes to be the man of sin, understanding, too, the day of the Lord, of the destruction of Jerusalem. But it appears from Euseb., that Simon died some years before the destruction of Jerusalem; and there is no evidence to prove that the Gnostics subsisted as a sect, and still less that they preached at so early a period. See Tittmann's able Tract de vestigiis Gnosticorum, in N. T. Grot. takes Caius Cæsar to be meant by the man of sin; and the apostacy he understands of his impiety and abominable wickedness. (See the note of Grot.) But this is too improbable to deserve any attention. Wets. understands the *apostacy* of the rebellion and slaughter of the three Princes who, before Vespasian, had been proclaimed by the Roman Emperors: and he takes the man of sin to have been Titus and the Flavian house! But this hypothesis is as little entitled to notice as the last.* Far more attention is due to the opinion of Koppe, who, after a long and able review of the principal hypothesis in a copious Excursus, proposes his own, which is thus detailed by Rosenm.: "Koppe omnem, quæ sequitur, impietatis descriptionem ex loco Dan. 11 5, 6. repetitam esse statuit. Utram vero Apostolus ipse hunc omnem Prophetæ locum ad prodigia regnum Messię prægressura loco nostro primus accommodaverit, an vero ex eodem, jam antea aliud gentis Judaicæ oraculum (non aliud quidem libris sacris comprehensum, sed inter Judæos tamen notissimum), conflatum, hocque ipsum ab Apostolo demum ad suam rem accommodatum fuerit, certo sibi non liquere fatetur, probabilis tamen posterius existimat, quum quæ in magna alias, locorum Danielis et nostri similitudine, negari non potest in nonnullis dissimilitudo, ex hac ratione facilius intelligi et explicari posse videatur. (Ad locum Danielis respexisse Apostolum, a verosimili haud abhorret; reliqua vero conjecturis nituntur.) Ex hac igitur hypothesi admonet Apostolus Christianos suos de eo, quod jam aliunde maximè ex ipsis V. T. oraculis edocti erant, non posse diem

* Noesselt and Rosenm. interpret the ἀποστασία of the sedition of the Jews, and their insurrection against the Roman government. An hypothesis nearly the same with that of Whitby, Hamm., and Schoettg., and which is supported with the usual ability of those eminent writers; but it may suffice to refer the reader to Rosenmuller's note.

illum, quem tam anxie expectarent, adesse, nisi errores, vitia, calamitates denique insignes in oraculis istis prædicta antea venissent; deinde vero, quam insignem quandam errorum et improbitatis contagionem, jam tum gliscere, partim inter Thessalonicenses, partim in cæteris ecclesiis Paulus animadverteret, ipse adventum Christi, etsi non illico futurum, tamen etiam non longè remotum et optans et facile sperans, hanc ipsam improbitatem ad singularis istius prædictæ impietatis initia referre non dubitat, ejusdem tamen incrementa ante Christi adventum multo adhuc majora magisque tremenda fore prævidet et conminatur." It is not improbable that the Apostle had the passage of Daniel in mind (as was the opinion of the early Commentators), but (as Rosenm. observes) the other parts of the hypothesis rest upon mere conjecture.

The above opinions are all evidently *too limited*. To me, it appears, that the whole portion is a *prophecy* proceeding from direct revelation from God, or Jesus Christ, and *perhaps* not fully understood by the *Apostle himself*, nor meant to be understood by any, till its accomplishment, which was to be by no means speedy, but gradual. Hence the antient Commentators had less chance than ourselves of discovering its real import. Much perplexed with it they were, but shewed their usual sagacity and prudence, by supposing the prophecy to be one of distant accomplishment (for they understood, by the *day of the Lord*, the *day of Judgment*: and the *ἀποστασία*, and *man of sin*, they considered as equivalent to *Antichrist* in the Apocalypse, who, they supposed, would not arise till after the destruction of the Roman Empire. And so Benson), and therefore not to be fully comprehended before its completion. Upon the whole, I find no interpretation which I can *adopt*, though I acknowledge there is much to countenance that of many moderns, as Mede, Benson, Dodd., Mackn., and most Protestant Commentators, who take the whole to have reference to the odious usurpations of the Roman Pontiffs, and the abominable corruptions of the Romish Church. Now, the idiom, by which a series of persons filling an office are spoken of as *one*, is well known, and satisfactorily established by the Commentators in loc., and Bp. Newton on the Prophecies, Diss. 22. Thus the *ἀποστασία* will signify the defection and usurpation of *the man of sin*, who placed himself in the temple of God for forty-two months, i. e. 1,260 years. See Rev. 11, 2. This great adversary of the Church is rightly regarded by the antients as the same with the *Antichrist* of Apoc. 13., who is there predicted as arising *from the Church*.

My limits will not permit me to enlarge further on this interpretation, but the reader is referred to the masterly Dissertations of Mede and Benson, and also the Annotations of the latter. Few (I think) can rise from a perusal of those excellent Tracts, without feeling that the points of resemblance between the apostacy of the man of sin, &c., and various well known traits of the Romish Church, are such as not a little to countenance the interpretation in question.

In *briefly* explaining the phraseology of the following verses it is impossible for me to state the *various* expositions of words and

phrases according to the various views taken of the general scope of the whole passage. I must, therefore, content myself with chiefly detailing such as are adapted to the last mentioned, as being the most common and probably as true an interpretation as any other.

4. ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ υπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα. In the ὁ ἀντικ., a term often used of one who is in opposition to, and at variance with, God and his people (as Is. 46, 6., Phil. 1, 28., 1 Tim. 6, 14.); there seems to be an allusion to him who is called Antichrist in the Apocalypse. And such is the opinion of several eminent Commentators, antient and modern.

4. ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν, i. e. (as Benson explains) any one that is truly called God, to whom the name of God can be justly applied. Σέβασμα simply denotes an object of veneration, and is properly applicable to a God (as Acts 17, 23., Wisd. 14, 20., 11, 17. See Schleus. Lex.), but was also used of Emperors and Kings, considered by the Oriental nations as God's vicegerents on earth. Benson and others think that by τὸν λεγόμενον Θεὸν is meant, magistrates, called *Gods*, in Ps. 82, 6.; and that σέβασμα is meant especially of the Roman Emperor; as appears from its affinity to Σεβαστὸς, *Augustus*, the name given to the Cæsars.

How closely *this* corresponds to the conduct of the Roman Pontiffs, every attentive reader of History, Ecclesiastical or Civil, must perceive. It is well observed by Dodd., that if this be not applicable to *that*, it is difficult to say who there ever has been, or can be, to whom it should belong.

4. ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ—Θεός. His *sitting in the temple of God* must, according to the most natural interpretation of the words, import his ruling and presiding there, and arrogating authority in things spiritual as well as temporal.* How

* "It was (says Benson) the opinion of Jerome, Chrys., Œcumen., Theophyl., and other of the antients, that by *the temple of God*, the Apostle meant, not the temple of Jerusalem, but the Christian Church." Theodoret says, "The Apostle has called the [*Christian*]

strikingly this trait corresponds to the Roman Pontificate it is needless to remark.

5. οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι, ἔτι ὡν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν. These words show that the Apostle had before, *vivâ voce*, made the Thessalonians acquainted with this prophecy : and hence we may account for the brevity, and consequent obscurity, of this passage, which was evidently intended by the Apostle for the Thessalonians only. Benson remarks on the propriety with which the Apostle here uses the *singular* number ; since this was doubtless revealed to him only, and not to Silvanus and Timothy.

6. καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον—καιρῷ, “Ye know what is now the obstruction to his appearing openly, as he will do at his own proper season. (Benson.) By the τὸ κατέχον, and the ὁ κατέχον, at ver. 7., many understand, the Roman Emperor ; q. d. “he that holdeth the reins of empire.” But Benson thinks this does not well agree with the context, nor with the τὸ κατέχον here. I agree with him that the best interpretation is that of our common Version, “what withholdeth ;” which Chrys., and the antients, as well as most moderns, understand (not without reason) of the Roman *Empire*. So that, in fact, both interpretations come to the same thing. Chrys. (and after him others) first perceived the true reason for the obscurity of the wording, namely, a wish not to offend, or give umbrage to the higher powers, by speaking openly and freely of the downfall of the Roman Empire.

Churches the temple of God, in which the man of sin will, by violence, seize the supremacy ; endeavouring to show that he himself is a God.” To confirm this interpretation, it may be remarked, that in other texts of the N. T., the Christian Church is called *the temple of God*, or compared to a temple. 1 Cor. 3, 9., 16, 17., and 6, 19., 2 Cor. 6, 16., Eph. 2, 20, 21 and 22., 1 Tim. 3, 15., Hebr. 3, 6., 1 Pet. 2, 5, Rev. 3, 12. Benson also well defends the reading ὡς Θεὸν,, which words are omitted in several antient MSS., Versions, and Fathers ; while others read ὡς ὅτι ἐστι Θεός, or ὡς ἂν ᾗ Θεός ; observing, that the antients could not see the beauty and propriety of it, as we, who have lived to see the accomplishment, may easily do.

The ἐν ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ Mackn. explains, "the season fittest for his usurping and exercising that sinful destructive tyranny in the Church, on account of which he is termed *the man of sin*, and the *son of perdition*."

7. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τ. ἅ., "For this mystery of iniquity (or this secret principle of iniquity) doth already operate (secretly). Only there is one that obstructs, and will do so till he be removed." Austin de Civ. D. L. 20, 19. has the following remarkable words: "Some understand the καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἶδατε and the τὸ μυστήριον ἤδη κατεργεῖται, of wicked and hypocritical persons in the Church, till they come to such a number as to make a great people for Antichrist: and that this is the *mystery of iniquity*, because it is as yet a secret." On the mystery of iniquity's *working*, though more secretly, in the days of the Apostles, compare Matt. 24, 4, 24, &c. Acts 15, 1 and 24. and 20, 29. Rom. 16, 17 and 18. 1 Cor. 15, 12. 2 Cor. 11, 3, 13, &c. Gal. 2, 4 and 3, 1. Col. 2, 18. 1 Thess. 3, 11 and 12. 2 Thess. 3, 6, &c. 1 Tim. 1, 19 and 20. 2 Tim. 2, 16. &c. and 3, 6, &c. and 4, 3 and 4. Tit. 1, 19, &c. Hebr. 3, 11, &c. and 10, 25 and 35. James 2, 1, &c. 14, &c. and 4, 1, &c. and 5, 9. 2 Pet. 2, 1, &c. 1 Joh. 2, 18 and 19. and 4, 1, 2 and 3. 2 Joh. ver. 7, &c. 3 Joh. ver. 9, 10 and 11. Jude, ver. 3, &c. Rev. c. 2 and 3. (Benson.) I would, however, (with Dodd.) understand this of the *antichristian spirit* which began to work in the Christian Church then, in the pride and ambition of some ministers, the factious temper of some Christians, the corruption of many Christian doctrines, the imposing unauthorized severities, the worship of angels, &c. of all which things the Papacy availed itself for acquiring and exercising its iniquitous dominion. Bishop Newton maintains that the foundations of Popery were laid in the Apostle's days, but the superstructure was raised by degrees.

7. ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται. Here Chrys. (as cited by

Benson) annotates: "When the Roman empire shall be taken out of the way, then shall the man of sin come.—When that shall be overthrown, he shall invade the vacant [seat of] empire, and attempt the empire both of men and of God." "How surprising (says Benson) are these words! How remarkably plain and express! Can any thing be said more clearly even now, after this signal event has taken place?"

8. καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος. The Apostle's principal design, ver. 3—12. is not to give a description of things then existing; but a prediction of some remarkable *future* events. When the obstructing power is taken away, then it shall no longer be a *mystery* of iniquity, or operate secretly; but then shall that wicked one be openly and publicly revealed. (Benson.)

The words ὁ ὁ Κύριος—αὐτοῦ, Benson thinks, ought to be put into a parenthesis. Which certainly clears the connection, and indeed they are in some measure parenthetical. They may be rendered: "When, however, the Lord will destroy with the breath of his mouth, bring to nought at his glorious appearance." Τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος. These words admit of several senses, none of them inapplicable. Some Commentators take them to mean *the word*, or *Gospel*; and the ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας, the preaching of it in full glory. Others, the gradual consumption of this wicked one by the preaching of the Gospel, and his final abolition at the last advent of Christ. But such a sense cannot well be elicited from the words. Benson (I think) rightly maintains that both these clauses relate to one and the same event; 1. the *ease* with which Christ will destroy the man of sin (so Ps. 33, 6—9. Job. 4, 9. Is. 11, 4. "slaying the wicked with the breath of his lips): 2. the *time* when he will effect it." Others explain: "quasi solo afflatu;" since with such the Divine power can consign men to death and destruction. And Wets. compares Plaut. Mil. Gl. 1, 1, 16.

Quojus tu legiones difflavasti spiritu quasi ventus folia. See also Wetstein's Rabbinical examples. The sense is the same ; but though the latter is the more poetical and elegant figure, yet it is perhaps the less true one.

8. ἀναλώσει and καταργήσει are nearly synonymous. Τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ. Some render this : "with or by the brightness," &c. Others (as Benson), "at the brightness, &c. destroy him." But this is not permitted by the antithesis, and far less elegant ; though the difference in the sense is not so great. All seem agreed that the ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ is for παρουσία ἐπιφάνης, glorious and splendid appearance. The term ἐπιφανεία is often employed by the Classical writers to denote any *Divine Majesty* ; and is applied in the New Testament to Christ's advent in the flesh ; also to his second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But is especially suitable (as here) to his final advent to judgment. See Benson.

9. οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία—τέρασι ψεύδους. The οὗ is to be referred to the more remote antecedent ὁ ἄνομος, not the nearer one αὐτοῦ ; the preceding sentence being parenthetical. Κατ' ἐνεργείαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ, "under the working of Satan ; accompanied with Satanic and diabolical working." Ἔστι, "is to be." Ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει, καὶ σημείοις, καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους. Some understand this of divers kinds of miracles. But this is liable to many objections, which are stated by several Commentators, especially Benson, according to the view in which it is considered." He apprehends that the same miracle *may* be called by the one or the other of these names, according to the view in which it is considered. "By δύναμις (says he) I understand a *miracle*, as it is the effect of an extraordinary or divine power : by σημείον may be meant a miracle, as it is a proof (or sign) of a prophetic or extraordinary mission : by τέρας, a miracle, as it excites wonder, or admiration, in the person upon whom it is worked, or in the spectator." This would, however, seem refining too much.

Neither, however, can I think that there are meant three different sorts of miracles. To me it seems that ἐν δυνάμει ἔσται has the general sense, “shall be accompanied with miracles, or pretended miraculous powers.” And then the words καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους are (I think) exegetical of the preceding (καὶ signifying *even*), and represent the species of miracles: and the ψεύδος, which has the force of an adjective, denotes that both shall be fictitious. So Rom. 15, 9. ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων. The two words are usually employed together in the New Testament, like the Hebr. מִסִּימֹת and מִסִּמְלֹת; as Matt. 24, 24. Mark 13, 22. Joh. 4, 48. and elsewhere. How applicable this also is to the fictitious miracles of the Church of Rome (which are even at the present period asserted by her advocates with a degree of extravagance and effrontery never exceeded even in the darkest ages) it is almost needless to remark.

10. καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀγάπῃ τῆς ἀδικίας ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, “and by every unrighteous deceit and imposture;” the genitive of the substantive being for an adjective; a very common idiom. Ἐν, *among*. By the ἀπολλυμ. Benson understands “such as are lost to all sense of virtue and piety, or the desperately and incorrigibly wicked. It is opposed (he observes) to the *saved* or reformed, 1 Cor. 1, 18. 2 Cor. 2, 15. and 4, 3. But this is going too far. It seems to signify, “by the *wretched* victims of their deceit.” Ἀνθ’ ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην—αὐτοῦς. The ἀνθ’ ὧν (which, as Grot. observes, is a formula denoting that something is inflicted as a punishment, or conferred as a recompense) carries with it an ellipsis, which may be thus supplied: “and a prey they will be to such delusions, because,” &c. The phrase ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξατο is a very unusual (and perhaps Hebraic) one, on whose sense the Commentators differ. Grot. renders: “they have not received the blessed truth made known to us by the Gospel.” But this sense cannot be elicited from the words, which are better explained by most Interpreters, “they did not *care*

to receive the truth." There seems to be a blending of two phrases together: "they did not love the truth, and they would not receive it." There is, too (as Beza and Benson think), a *meiosis*. As to the sense assigned by some, "they will profess the truth, but not love it (as Tim. 3. 5.);" though well suited to the persons in question, it seems very precarious.

10. εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι, Benson renders: "though it would have been their everlasting salvation."

11. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, "and for this cause;" i. e. because they have not had any love of the truth. For, as Benson observes, there is no effectual preservative from fatal error but the sincere love of truth and virtue. Πέμψει αὐτοῖς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, i. e. "God will permit error to work its dire effects among them." For, as all the best Commentators antient and modern are agreed, we are here to resort to that idiom by which God is figuratively said to *do* a thing which he only *permits* to be done. So Theophyl.: πέμψει ἀντὶ τοῦ παραχωρήσει αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν. "Thus (adds he) as they first rejected the truth, so then God leaves them, and error prevails over them." So Benson: "God leaves wicked men to their own choice, and turns their sin into their punishment."

11. εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει, "so that they believe the lie (put upon them)." Εἰς denotes, not the final cause, but the *effect*. By the ψεύδ. Mackn. would understand *transubstantiation*. But it should seem to be meant, in a general way, of the *whole system* of falsehood promulgated by the man of sin, and his adherents; though it is true, transubstantiation is the *fundamental* "lie" from which have proceeded most others of the Romish Church.

12. ἵνα κριθῶσι πάντες—ἀδικία. The best Commentators are agreed, that ἵνα is here (as very often) *eventual*; "So that they may all be condemned;" (κριν. for κατακρ.) The *damned* of our Common Version means no more; an use of the word which is well illustrated from one of our old writers by the

learned Dr. Maltby, in the note to the second volume of his eloquent and masterly Sermons. In the same manner Theophyl. explains as follows: οὐκ εἶπεν ἵνα κολασθῶσι, ἀλλὰ κατακριθῶσι, ὥστε εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολόγητους. Yet this condemnation necessarily carries with it the idea of *punishment* both in this world and the next: for such mischievous delusions lead to *both*.

On the opposition between ἀληθεία and ἀδικία see the note on ver. 10. By *having pleasure in wickedness* is meant, complacently dwelling upon such false doctrines as foster error, and encourage vice. Dr. Doddridge here supposes this to be levelled against the gainful frauds of the *Romish priests*, who impose on the people known delusions, merely out of regard to secular interest. But I fear that to *others* also, the words of St. Peter (respecting Balaam) may be too applicable: "He loved the wages of unrighteousness."

13. ἡμεῖς δε—σωτηρίαν. The Apostle had said at 1, 3. "*We ought to give thanks unto God always for you, brethren,*" &c. Having, since that, assured them of Christ's coming to destroy the wicked, and make happy the righteous; and that the day of the Lord would not come till there had been a dreadful apostacy in the Christian Church, and the man of sin be revealed; he repeats his kind commendations of the Thessalonians, and says again, "*We ought to give thanks unto God always for you, brethren,*" &c. (Benson.)

The sense is: "We are bound to give perpetual thanks to God for you (namely, that it is not the case with *you*, but) that God hath, from the beginning, chosen you to salvation," &c. I see not any grounds for rendering ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, as do some recent Commentators, *inter primos*; a sense unauthorized, and not a little frigid. Other interpretations yet less probable have been brought forward; but the only one that has the stamp of truth is that of the antients, and almost all the early moderns, who refer

it to the eternal purposes of God, in the election and calling of the Thessalonians to the Christian faith. And to this the Apostle frequently alludes at the commencement of his Epistles to Gentile Churches. The passage is well paraphrased by Theophyl. (from Chrysos.) thus : διὰ τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐξελέξατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός, καὶ προώρισεν εἰς σωτηρίαν, ἀξίους δηλαδὴ προγνούς. See Benson.

The ἐν ἀγιασμῷ—ἀληθείας, I think, points out the *means* by which this is to be effected ; ἐν signifying **by**. The following may be supplied : “ (and which will be effected) by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, and by a faith in the truth (as especially promotive of it.)” By the πίστει ἀληθείας, Benson says, is meant such a belief of truth as shall produce moral obedience ; referring to 1 Pet. 1, 22. Joh. 17, 17. Acts 15, 9. But this seems too precarious. All I would venture to infer is, (what the antient Commentators tell us) that these words have reference to the separate parts allotted to God and to man in the business of human salvation. See the note on Phil. 2, 13. I cannot touch on the many varieties of interpretation to be found among the Commentators on the present passage, yet I must not omit to enter my protest against that license by which Mackn. and some recent Commentators take πνευμ. to mean no more than the *mind*, or *rational principle* ; which is inconsistent with the strong expression preceding, ἀγιασμός Πνεύματος.

14. εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσεν—Χριστοῦ. The εἰς ὃ (for which some MSS. read εἰς ἣν, by emendation,) refers to the whole foregoing clause, the being sanctified, &c. “ Unto all this God hath called you by our Gospel, as preached by me.” So Theophyl. : εἰς ποῖον ; εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ ἀγιασμοῦ καὶ τῆς πίστεως. The words following, εἰς περιποίησιν, &c. state the *purpose* for which that Gospel was preached, namely, the obtaining of the glory (i. e. participation in the glory) of Jesus Christ, i. e. *salvation*, which is often represented under the term *glory*, *honour*, &c. So

περιποίησις is used in 1 Thess. 5, 9. and Hebr. 10, 39. Some interpret περιπ. of life and salvation. But this is very harsh. It is truly observed by Benson, that the end of calling men into the Christian Church, and purifying their souls thereby, is, that they may obtain the glory which is promised by our Lord Jesus Christ, will be conferred by him, and enjoyed in his presence. See Joh. 14, 3. and 17, 22. Rom. 8, 17 and 18. 1 Thess. 5, 9.

15. ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε. In the στήκατε there is a military metaphor; as Gal. 5, 1. 1 Cor. 16, 13. Phil. 4, 1. Στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις, “stand firm, and hold fast,” &c. Παραδόσεις signifies, not traditions in the usual sense, but doctrines, precepts, and instructions;* as 3, 6. Matt. 15, 2. 1 Cor. 11, 2. Κρατεῖν, like κατέχειν in 1 Cor. 11, 2. καὶ καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, Mark 7, 8., signifies yielding steady obedience to. The διὰ λόγου denotes vivâ voce instruction; the δι’ ἐπιστολῆς, *epistolary*: for the singular will not prove that the Apostle referred to his former Epistle (as

* Theophyl. here pleads for the authority of *tradition* in enjoining us to reverence certain articles of faith not contained in Scripture, but handed down by oral tradition. “Now (observes Benson) what does the Church of Rome know by *oral tradition*, which we do not know as well without it?” Besides, the tradition frequently mentioned and contended for by the Fathers, was not the oral tradition which the Papists contend for, but the allegorical interpretation of particular texts, started at first perhaps by some persons of note, and handed down, by word or writing, to succeeding ages. They therefore supposed them to be grounded upon some passage of Scripture, and not to be such traditions as have no foundation there. If one could be equally certain of the truth and authenticity of any other *Apostolic traditions*, as of those contained in the writings of the Apostles, undoubtedly they would deserve great regard. But, after the Apostles had, by Divine illumination, preached the *Christian doctrine*; under the guidance of the same spirit of truth, they committed to writing the very same doctrine (or tradition), and that very much with a view to prevent Christians from being imposed upon by other and false traditions.” See also Mackn. and Whitby, and an able Tract of Dr. Miller, entitled an Historical view of the Plea of Tradition as maintained in the Church of Rome.

Benson supposes); δι' ἐπιστολῆς signifies literally *in*, or *by*, *any Epistle*, i. e. the former, the present, or any other that he should hereafter write them.

16, 17. ὁ ἀγαπήσας—ἐν χάριτι. It is observed by Theophyl., that after *exhortation* comes *prayer*; which is really helping them. Δέ, *autem*. The ἡμῶν is to be referred to all Christians; q. d. “our common Lord.” The force of the sentence is: “I pray our Lord Jesus Christ and God our Father to,” &c. From hence it is easy to prove the Deity of Christ. See Lesl. ap. D'Oyley. Καὶ πᾶτῆρ, “even our Father;” as Eph. 1, 3. 4, 6. 5, 20. and often. Koppe and Rosenm. observe, that the words ὁ ἀγάπησας ἡμᾶς καὶ θεὸς are to be conjoined, and rendered “qui pro suo in nos favore dat,” &c. But this is confounding the Oriental and Occidental styles of writing; which, in the translation of *any* work of *antiquity*, good taste would require us to avoid. Nor do I agree with those Commentators, that παρακλ. and ἐλπ. are synonymous with σωτηρίας and εὐδαιμονίας. This sort of interpretation seems, indeed, to shorten our labour; but by introducing confusion, it, in reality, increases it. The two notions are better kept separate. If any deviation from the common rendering of the words be thought necessary, I should propose that καὶ be rendered *even*; which is supported by the antients. Thus Theophyl.: Θεὸς παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν. Ποίαν δὲ ταύτην; Τὴν ἐλπίδα, φησὶ, τῶν μελλόντων· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνέχουσα τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν καταπιπτούσας ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς, ἡ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ἐλπίς. And so Benson: “Their consolation arose from the hope of everlasting life and happiness. Tit. 2, 13. 1 Thess. 4, 13, &c. and 5, 11. 1 Pet. 1, 3 and 4. and was therefore called *everlasting*.” He also observes, that under the guise of prayer the Apostle excites their minds by setting before them the pledges of God's care and providence. By adding ἐν χάριτι, he represses all self-complacence.

17. παρακαλέσαι—ἀγαθῶ may be rendered, “com-

fort your hearts (as 2 Cor. 1, 4. 7, 6. Eph. 6, 22. 1 Thess. 4, 18. 5, 11.) under all your affliction.” Καὶ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ. The sense of these words is (I think) very imperfectly seen and represented by most modern Commentators (including Koppe), who take them for εἰς πάντα λόγον καὶ ἔργον ἀγαθόν, with this sense, “ut quæ recta sunt ea loquamini et agatis.” It should seem that in this passage the scope of the Apostle is. to represent the two chief ways by which the love of God, under the influence of his Word and blessed Spirit, aids us in this our earthly struggle: 1. by comforting our hearts under afflictions and persecutions; 2. by supporting us amidst all temptations, whether to abandon *true doctrine*, or virtuous and holy *practice*.

On the παρακαλέσαι (which I have just explained) there is no difference of opinion. That the ἀγαθὸν refers to both λόγῳ and ἔργῳ, is clear; but it must be modified in the application: and in the former case (I think) it must denote *sound doctrine*, i. e. (as Koppe says) the ἀληθεία spoken of at ver. 10, as opposed to the πλάνη and ἀπάνη just after: which is supported by the authority of Theophyl. (from Chrys.), who paraphrases and explains thus: στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς ἔντε δόγμασιν ὀρθοῖς, καὶ πράξεσιν ἀγαθοῖς, ὥστε μὴ παραφέρεσθαι, μηδὲ καταπίπτειν ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβαίνουσιν· τοῦτο ἔστι παρακλήσις· Ὁ γὰρ ἐστηριγμένος, ὅσαπερ ἂν πάθῃ, φέρεי γεναίως, καὶ οὐ παρατρέπεται· διὰ μὲν τοῦ τὸ δόγμα τηρεῖν ὀρθὸν πεπεισμένος περὶ τῶν μελόντων βεβαίως· διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθὸν βίον ἔχειν, χαίρων ὅτι οὐχ ὡς κακουργὸς, ἀλλ’ ὡς Θεοῦ λειτουργὸς πάσχει.

Most Commentators think the ἐν λόγῳ is for διὰ λόγου, &c. But this is not necessary. The phrase literally signifies, “may he support and confirm you in the profession of sound doctrine, and in the performance of right practice.”

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. προσεύχεσθε—ὑμᾶς. The Apostle, with his accustomed humility, desires their prayers: but as the *περὶ ἡμῶν* is suspended on an *ἵνα* following, I think it should be rendered, “pray respecting us that,” &c. He does not ask their prayers *generally*, or for any *worldly blessing*, but especially that the Gospel may, through his means, have free course, namely, by the removal of the obstacles under which he then laboured. Or the *ἡμῶν* may also include Silvanus and Timothy, especially as they had assisted in planting the Gospel at Thessalonica; and this is confirmed by the *καθὼς πρὸς ὑμᾶς*.

The *λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου τρέχει* is well compared by Koppe with the Hebr. *ירוצ רבר יהרה*, Ps. 147, 15. *his word runneth very swiftly*. I would compare Eurip. Ion 531. Matth. *τρέχων ὁ μῦθος ἀν σοι τὰ μὰ σημήνειεν αὐν*. The sense is, “be speedily transmitted from region to region.” *Καὶ δοξάζεται*, “and be glorified, approve itself to me, and gain acceptance and faithful fulfilment of its requisitions.” For *that* also seems to be meant; and thus in the insertion *καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς* is couched a delicate praise. *Πρὸς, among*.

2. καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων, “And (in order thereto) that we may be delivered from (the persecutions and opposition) of,” &c. On the sense of *ἀτοπ.* Commentators are not agreed. Most render it *unreasonable*; some, *perverse*; Mackn. (following here, as often, a precarious etymology) *brutish*, (men who have or ought to have, no place in society.*) Most recent Commentators avoid the difficulty by making it synonymous

* This cacoethes etymologisandi has here infected stronger minds than Macknight. Thus Erasm.: “qui nullo loco convenient, quales sunt *hæretici*.” Doddr.: “whom no topics can work on.” Est.: “who wander from place to place, persecuting the Gospel.”

with *πονηρῶν*. But a proper regard to the words following, *οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις* might have taught them better. Crell. has here been most successful. He understands it of those “quorum mens prava est, et judicium corruptum, ac perversum, distortumque; qui absurdè de rebus sentiunt, nec se in certum veritatis iter, ob contumaciam ac pervicaciam animi, flecti patiuntur.” The *πονηρῶν* denotes vicious, immoral men; though it may have an adjunct notion of malignity; and both dispositions unfit men for the discerning of the truth.

2. *οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις*. The sense of these words is strangely perverted by the recent Commentators, who render it, “for there are few good men whom we can safely trust;” taking *οὐ πάντων* for *ὀλίγων*. And so Howe, Homberg, Schoettg., Koppe, Rosenm., and Valpy. But this signification of *πίστις* is unprecedented both in the Scriptural and Classical writers; and therefore the interpretation must fall to the ground, which indeed yields a very frigid sense. Others, as Doddr. and Koppe, take *πίστις* to denote *integrity* and *candour*. But this yields a miserably feeble and far-fetched sense. (See also Mackn.) The same may be said of Benson’s version, “for all men do not embrace the Christian faith, but many oppose it;” which both requires a *meiosis*, and must be helped out by another sentence; than which nothing can be more harsh. I see no reason to abandon the interpretation of Chrysost. and the other antients, and also the early moderns, by which the words are taken in their plain and natural sense, i. e. (as Theophyl. explains) “all men do not believe, but the worthy only.” And *thus*, after discussing at large the various interpretations, Wolf expounds. The Calvinists, indeed, render: “for faith is not in the *power* of all men.” And, I confess, this seems most agreeable to the force of the idiom. I must, however, protest against having the text urged on the controversy respecting *free will*, &c.; since it is plain

that the *non posse* is here, as very often in Scripture, applied *populariter*, to moral, not physical, impossibility. So Crell.: “Fidei non sunt omnes capaces, non per se et naturâ suâ; cùm omnes Deus ad agnitionem veritatis pervenire, atque ita salvâri cupiat, omnesque, qui modo non sunt mente capti, naturâ suâ et credendâ intelligere, et præstandâ facere, si modo velint, possint; sed ob susceptam et acquisitam sponte animi improbitatem; quâ in habitatum versâ, id quod naturâ suâ erat possibile, redditur quodammodo impossibile. Breviter, facultatem ab illis removet proximam, ut vocant, non remotam; illa enim voluntatis, hæc naturæ.” And so Dr. Wells (whose interpretation is here, with great judgment, adopted by D'Oyley and Mant): “They have it not, or cannot attain to it; forasmuch as by their wickedness, ill practices, obstinate prejudices, and the like, they deprive themselves of the same;” that is, by being ἀτόποι and πονηροὶ, they unfit themselves for the reception of truth.

3. πιστὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ Κύριος—πονηροῦ. Those Commentators who in the preceding verse interpret πίστις *fidelity*, here suppose an antithesis. But it has been shown that that interpretation is without foundation; and (as Benson observes) “the Apostle often uses a word in *allusion* to what he had just been saying, and that in a somewhat *different sense*.” Besides, πιστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐστὶ is a frequent formula with the Apostle; as 1 Cor. 1, 8 and 9. and 1 Thess. 5, 24. It here signifies: “he will assuredly finish the good work he hath begun.” The sense may be simply expressed thus: “And this the Lord will do; for he is faithful to his promises; he will confirm, &c. Στηρίξει, “will establish you in true doctrine.” See 2, 2 and 3. 1 Thess. 3, 3 and 13. Καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Here the Commentators are divided in opinion; some taking τοῦ πονηροῦ for a neuter, i. e. *evil*, either of calamity, or apostacy: others, for a masculine, i. e. the author of evil, *Satan*. And this is supported by the authority of the antients, and, being

far more agreeable to the context, is (no doubt) the true interpretation.

4. *πεποιθάμεν δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, "Now we trust in the Lord's protection over you, that what things we command you, ye both do and will do." Such is the literal sense. But there is something more to be attended to than a cursory view would suggest. The antients, as Chrys. and Theophyl., consider this and the preceding as representing the co-operation of divine and human power in working out salvation. The *στηρίζει*, *φυλάξει*, and *πεποιθάμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ* they refer to the *former*; the *ποιεῖτε* and *ποιήσατε* to the *latter*. Thus Theophyl. observes: *δεῖ μὲν γὰρ τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ῥίπτειν, ἀλλ' ἐνεργούντας καὶ αὐτοὺς*. And nearly the same view seems to have been taken by Benson. But (if I mistake not) it is precarious and unfounded. Yet there is a certain harshness in the words; since to say that he "trusts in the protection of God that they do what he enjoins," would seem incongruous. The confusion occasioned by *ποιεῖτε* may be removed, by supposing that the sentence consists of two members condensed into one, and which must be separated to clear the sense. There appears to be a dilogia in *πεποιθάμεν*, which is applicable to *both members*, with a slight change of sense. I would render: "Now we trust (and hope) that (upon the whole) ye are doing the things which we command you; and we trust in the Lord's assistance that ye will continue to do them." Thus all is clear.

5. *ὁ δὲ Κύριος—Χριστοῦ*. Koppe, after a minute discussion of the context and scope of the Apostle, lays down the following as the sense: "Non dubito, vos his præceptionibus meis esse obsecuturos, modo intentis animis et Dei ipsius exemplum in amandis beandisque suis hominibus, et Christi exemplum in tolerandis gravissimis calamitatibus constanter respi-ciatis. He takes, together with Rosenm., *ἀγάπη Θεοῦ* to denote the love shown by God towards men." But, I confess, I see not how this sense can be made out

without great violence. There seems no reason to abandon the common interpretation.* The sense may be thus expressed: "And now (in order thereto) may the Lord (by his Holy Spirit) direct your hearts unto the love of God." The ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ must (I think) be taken in a popular sense (like ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Θεὸν at Rom. 8, 28. τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. 1 Cor. 2, 9. ὃ ἑτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. 1 Cor. 8, 3. and elsewhere), to denote "such a love of God as shall produce faith in all that he reveals, and obedience to all that he commands," especially in showing love unto men for God's sake, without which our love is not genuine. See 1 Joh. 4, 12. 19, 20 & 21. 5, 2. But as obedience to the commands of God often requires of us self-denial and privation, and frequently involves *evil*, and since he that would come after Christ must take up his cross daily and follow him, so this was especially the case with Christians in the Apostolic age; and therefore the Apostle adds, εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which does *not* mean (as Rosenm. and Schleus. explain) the patience itself of Christ in bearing calamities, but a patient endurance, suffering for righteousness, after the example of Christ; or a patient waiting for Christ. Both these interpretations are supported by the antients. Thus Theophyl.: ἢ ἵνα ὑπομένωμεν, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ὑπέμεεν· ἢ ἵνα μετ' ὑπομονῆς ἀναμένωμεν τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ μὴ ἀπελπίζωμεν, ἀλλὰ πιστεύωμεν βεβαίως, ὅτι ὁ ἐπηγγείλατο πληρῶσει. Either is agreeable to the

* I cannot but observe that this and many other false interpretations which I have lately animadverted upon, seem to have been introduced from certain doctrinal prejudices, a vain fear of that bug-bear, Calvinism. But it is one thing to form a body of Scriptural annotation, and another to form a body of divinity. It seems most unwarrantable to suppress, or explain away, the sense of all three passages, which tend to show man's dependence upon God in the work of salvation. For, after all, we may be well assured (in the words of the Poet) that

"Oars alone can ne'er prevail To reach the distant coast;

"The breath of heaven must swell the sail, Or all the labour's lost."

usus loquendi; but the former seems the more suitable to the context. Yet Benson prefers the *latter*; though he also proposes to understand it of the patient expectation of Christ's second advent; which, perhaps, may be *included* in the former.

6—16. One may observe the address with which the Apostle first makes use of soothing language to show his affection for them, and to soften the reproofs he was about to introduce, as proceeding alone from love. Now these reproofs were meant to correct a spirit which, while he was at Thessalonica, the Apostle had remarked among some Christians, namely, a disposition to be idle, and throw themselves on the bounty of their richer and more industrious brethren for maintenance. These he had before enjoined to “quietly work, and eat their own meat.” As, however, his injunctions had been little attended to, he *repeats* them with greater authority and earnestness; strictly commanding the other Christians to break off all familiar intercourse with such, in order thereby to bring them to shame and repentance.

Παραγγέλλομεν. A term used of all *strict orders* from superiors, as from kings to their subjects, or generals to their soldiers. The sense, then, is: “we strictly command you.” To make it the more impressive, the Apostle, as on some other occasions, adds ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου. The construction is: (ὥστε) ὑμᾶς στέλλεσθαι. And στελλ. is of the middle voice for στέλλειν, or ὑποστέλλειν ἑαυτὸν, “withdraw yourselves from (all intercourse with).” Theophyl. explains, χωρίζεσθαι ἀπὸ. Numerous Classical passages are here adduced by the philological Commentators, but none of them to the present purpose, and more fit for a Greek Lexicon than a commentary on the New Testament.

Παντὸς (which corresponds to the Heb. כָּל) signifies *each*. With respect to the expression ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος, it *might* be interpreted of disobedience to the orders of the Apostle; but from what follows,

especially ver. 12., it is plain that the Apostle has in view a living without labour at their trades; and, as vices run in clusters, so idleness draws with it many other vices, which no pretences of attending to spiritual concerns will effectually prevent. And *this*, the phrase ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν, meaning an unsettled, disorderly, and sometimes dissolute life, will very well characterize.*

7, 8. The Apostle here very properly calls in his *own example* in aid of his *precepts*. See 1 Thess. 1, 6. Ἀτακτεῖν is for the ἀτακτῶς περιπατεῖν at ver. 6., and is fully explained at ver. 12. The sense is, “did not thus walk disorderly.” Ἄρτον φαγεῖν (Hebr. לֶחֶם לֶחֶם) παρὰ τινὸς is a common phrase for, “to receive of any one what shall provide us with sustenance.” Δωρεὰν, which usually signifies gratis, for nought, here denotes, “without working for it.” Now the Apostle received, indeed, of his employers money for his sustenance, but he rendered work in return for it, as is suggested by what follows, which is exegetical of the preceding, the participle ἐργαζόμενοι being suspended on ἐφάγομεν. The other expressions have been all explained before. Compare 1 Cor. 4, 12. Acts 20, 34. and 1 Thess. 1, 5. and 2, 9.

9. οὐκ ὅτι οὐχ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν, i. e. τοῦ δωρεὰν ἄρτον φαγεῖν παρ’ ὑμῶν, on which see 1 Cor. 9, 6. and 1 Thess. 2, 6. Ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δώμεν ὑ. ἐ. τ. μ. η. Τύπος signifies *exemplar*. See 1 Cor. 10, 1. 1 Tim. 4, 12. and Phil. 3, 17. Benson has here, and at 1 Thess. 2, 9., assigned six reasons why St. Paul did this. Of these the Apostle (he observes) urges different ones in different places, and under different circumstances.

* On what caused this disorderly spirit, writers differ. Most ascribe it to the expectation of Christ’s speedy advent. But the Apostle had not encouraged this, but the contrary. It may, I think (as I have before observed), be ascribed to that strong *mental excitement* which, in the working classes, tends to produce an indisposition to bodily labour.

10. εἴ τις οὐ θέλει—ἐσθιέτω. An adagial sentence, with which the philological Commentators (as Grot., Wets., &c.) compare numerous ones from the Classical and Rabbinical writers. These, on so trite a subject, I may be excused for omitting. It is well remarked by Grot.: “Amant Apostoli, ut et Christus, sentiendi bonis uti, quæ in ore erant populi aut sapientum.”

11. ἀκούομεν γὰρ. The γὰρ is rendered, by Koppe, *et tamen*. I am, indeed, no friend to that excessive minuteness with which some dwell on particles of this kind; but it is preferable to the *other extreme*, of arbitrarily fixing on senses, however unusual. Here the connection is plainly this: “(I am induced to now issue these orders) *for* I hear,” &c. The ἀτακτῶς περιπ. has been explained above. In the words μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους there is thought to be a paronomasia. And as the Apostle elsewhere not unfrequently uses that figure, he probably did so here. The term περιεργ. is one of considerable extent, and therefore uncertainty. It properly signifies to *labour exceedingly*; 2dly, *devote superfluous labour*; 3dly, *to labour or give one's attention to things which have no relation to one's own proper business*; which is usually the case with busy, meddling, pragmatical persons. And this is, by most Commentators, supposed to be the sense here. The recent ones understand it of wandering up and down to collect scandal, and retailing it in places where it may be acceptable; and thus gaining a miserable living, like the *parasites* of antient times. But this is too hypothetical and visionary. The most extensive signification will here (as usual) be the truest.

On this busy, meddling, detracting, and scandal-bearing spirit, Benson has some admirable remarks. See also the excellent passage of Lev. 44, 22., cited by Wets.

12. τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις—ἐσθίωσιν. Παραγγ. διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ. ὧ. I. X. is synonymous with the παραγγ. ἐν

ὀνόματι τοῦ Κ. Χ. at ver. 6., where see the note. Here the Apostle calls earnest exhortation and entreaty in aid of solemn injunction..

The μετὰ ἡσυχίας is opposed to that unsettled spirit which indisposed them for work, and set them on a disorderly life. The phrase τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθιεῖν seems to be adagial. Many similar expressions are cited from the Classical writers by Grot. and Wets., descriptive of the contrary. So the parasite is said to eat *cibum alienum*, *alienam quadram*, ἀλλοτριοφάγειν. I must not omit to observe that on this portion of Scripture Dr. Maltby has an admirable Sermon, vol. 2.

13. ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, μὴ ἐκκακήσητε καλοποιούντες. There is some difference of opinion on the sense of these words, the difficulty hinges on the καλ. Many modern Commentators take it in the general sense *recte agere*. So Koppe, who renders: "Vos vero in omni virtutis studio constantes estote." But this is little agreeable to what went before, which requires something more *special*; and I agree with the antients and many eminent moderns, that it must be understood of the practice of beneficence towards poorer brethren. So καλὸν ποιεῖν at Gal. 6, 9. (a very similar passage), and ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν at Matt. 3, 6., and often. Besides, as καλὸν ποιεῖν is a very rare phrase, scarcely occurring any where else, and as the Apostle has used καλὸν ποιεῖν in the sense of *beneficence* elsewhere, we can hardly suppose he would intend any other here. Yet I cannot assent to the antients that the sense is: "Let not their sloth hinder your charity in giving them what is necessary to preserve life." The Apostle could never, I think, mean *that*: for what is thus given, in order to keep alive the idle and disorderly, might be better employed in encouraging the *industrious* poor. I agree with Benson that it is probable the Apostle's caution was intended chiefly to guard them against being so affected with the unworthiness of

some, as to be weary of well-doing to *any*, even to proper and deserving objects. And, thus understood, this precept comes in very opportunely, and with the greatest propriety. For, as the ingratitude and unworthiness of some are very apt to render us cold and indifferent in doing good to others, the Apostle exhorted such as were able, to continue to show acts of kindness and beneficence, and not to be weary in well-doing to proper objects; notwithstanding some were idle and deserved not to be supported by them." I would here compare Synes: 177 A. (Ep. 30.) εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι μὴ ἀπαγορεύσεις εὖ ποιῶν.

14, 15. εἰ δὲ τις—σημειῶσθε. Τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν, "our word, or order." For λόγος, like the Heb. דבר, is a general term extending to order of every kind. Διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς. These words are, by some eminent Commentators, as Pisc., Grot., Le Clerc, Rosenm., and Bengel, joined with τοῦτον σημειῶσθε, in this sense: "send me word by letter of that man." But this seems very harsh and frigid, and little agreeable to what follows; and, moreover, it would require δι' ἐπιστολῆς. See Crell. and Benson. I see no reason to abandon the interpretation of most moderns (supported by the authority of the antients), who construe the words with the preceding τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν, and take τῆς for ταύτης. This sense of σημειῶσθαι (*set a mark upon*) may not be frequent; but it is justified by authority (See Steph. Thes. Nov. Edit.), and is supported by what follows; whereas the other sense proposed is supported neither by authority nor by the context. Loesner aptly compares Phil. Jud. 560 A. δυσὶν ἤδη μαρτυρίας σημειωσάμενος τὸ μηδὲν ἔχθος ὑποτύφεισθαι.

14. καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε αὐτῷ, "have no familiar intercourse with him;" like στέλλεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ just before. Compare 1 Cor. 5, 9 & 11. The words ἵνα ἐντραπῇ suggest the *reason* for this, namely, that the shame thereof might bring him to repentance. See Tit. 2, 8. The words following καὶ μὴ—ἀδελφόν are meant to further explain the purpose of the exclu-

sion, and to show how far it should be extended. It was to be considered as a *νοθεσία*, having in view not so much the punishment as the reformation of the offender. 2dly, The conduct adopted with regard to him was not to be so far removed from friendliness as to border on hostility. The *καὶ* signifies *and yet*. The phrase *ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθαι* is frequent in the Classical writers. See Wetstein's examples.

16. *αὐτὸς δὲ—ὑμῶν*. See the note on Thess. 5, 3.

17, 18. *ὁ ἀσπασμὸς—γράφω*. Thus far St. Paul had used the pen of a scribe. But the conclusion he writes with his own hand. See c. 1. Cor. 16, 27. Gal. 16, 11. Philem. 19. This, as has been before observed, was the Apostle's usual custom, for the purpose of assuring the persons to whom it was addressed, that the Epistle was not supposititious. Such, Koppe observes, is the plain sense of the passage; while the other interpretations proposed do manifest violence to the words.

FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. Παῦλος, ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ. See Whitby ap. Slade, and the notes of Benson. Κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, "by the command of God our Saviour." The name σωτὴρ is applicable to *God* as well as to Jesus Christ; since He sent the Saviour for us men and for our salvation. See Luke 1, 47. 1 Tim. 4, 10., and other passages adduced by Grot. *Why* God is so called can need no explanation; since He not only delivers us from evil, even the curse of the broken law, but confers blessings manifold, spiritual, and temporal. "This (says Benson) may teach us not to look upon God, the Father, as all justice and terror; and our Lord Jesus Christ, as all love and mercy. The original of our redemption, through Jesus Christ, was the love and goodness of the Father."

1. τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, "the cause of our hope;" by a metonymy of perpetual occurrence in Scripture.

2. Τιμοθέω γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, "our genuine, real, and spiritual son." On *Timothy* see the Historical Introduction, especially Benson in loc., who has shown that this *may* indicate that Timothy was his convert; since such are called his children. See Gal. 4, 19. 1 Thess. 2, 7 & 11. Tit. 1, 4. Philem. 10. compared with 1 Cor. 4, 14 & 5. Or he may be so called, as being of a disposition similar to the Apostle's. See Joh. 8, 44. and Matt. 13, 10. And

in Phil. 2, 2. he uses the same expression. Compare Phil. 2, 22., where see the notes. The former, however, is the more probable opinion; and the term seems to be the more appropriate, since (as Rosenm. remarks) there seems reason to think from 2 Tim. 3, 6., that he had been committed by his mother to Paul from his earliest years, in order to be formed after his model, by his precepts and example, so as to come to the stature of the fullness, &c. On the terms *χάρις*, *ἔλεος*, and *εὐσένη*, which are generally found united at the commencement of the Epistles, I have before treated.

3. *καθὼς παρεκάλεσα—ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, “as when I departed into Macedonia, I desired thee to remain at Ephesus (so now I exhort thee) to strictly charge certain persons, that they teach no doctrine different from ours.” Such, I conceive is the general sense; the words themselves are plain; but the construction is somewhat perplexed and elliptical. There is, as the best Commentators are agreed, a *trajectio*. The *πορευόμενος εἰς Μ.*, must be closely united with *καθὼς παρεκ.*, &c.; which is no other than the figure *anacoluthon*, so common to the Apostle; the *protasis* at *καθὼς*, as or because, being without an *apodosis*, which is left to be supplied. On the mode of doing this the Commentators are not agreed. The best interpreters supply *οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ*; which seems the most natural method: and so Benson. Others think that the *ἵνα παραγγείλῃς*, is an imperative, by the ellipsis of *ῥα.*; which they defend by some examples, but from writers *infimæ Gracitatis*. (See Koppe.) Others seek the *apodosis* at ver. 18.; which (as Heinr. remarks) is too violent an hyperbaton. In the Syriac Version the *οὕτω* is passed by. But that is *cutting* the knot: and the antient translators not unfrequently omit what is difficult.

The antients rightly remark on the difference between *παρεκάλεσα* and *παραγγείλῃς*, which may very well be ascribed to the difference of the persons addressed; since mildness and authority in Christian

rulers are equally necessary, each in their season. The *τισι* denotes *certain persons* who, though unnamed, were well known to Paul,* and of whose irregularities probably Timothy himself might have sent some notification to the Apostle.

The *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* many Commentators explain, “to teach doctrines different from those which I taught them.” But I rather agree with others, that it signifies, “to teach no other doctrines than those taught by myself and the other Apostles.” What was the exact nature of these doctrines we are left to conjecture: but from what we know was the case in other places, we may very well suppose (with the best Commentators antient and modern) that they were the doctrines of the Judaizers; and this further appears from what follows. Thus at 6, 3. it is explained by *μὴ προσέρχεσθαι ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις* I. X. Schleus. refers to Ignat. Ep. ad Polyc. § 3. and Euseb. H. E. 3, 32.

4. *μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις, καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις*. These words are meant to be exegetical of the preceding. At *προσέχειν* must be understood *νοῦν*. It signifies properly to *give the mind to*, to *attend to*; and 2dly, to *credit*. These *μύθ.* relate to the interpretations of the Rabbis. Theophyl. explains: *τὰς παρατηρήσεις καὶ τὰ παρακεχαράγμενα* (Œcumen. *παραπεποιήμενα*) *δόγματα*. And Theodoret: *τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἐρμηνείαν, τὴν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν καλουμένην δευτέρωσιν* (*Mischna*.) For *γενεαλογίαις*, which follows, Bentley conjectured *κενολ.* (and other conjecturers otherwise.) But that is supported by no authority: neither is it necessary. The *καὶ* seems to signify *nempe*, and is meant (as Rosenm. says) to exemplify the *μύθ.* The epithet *ἀπέραντος* denotes, “*that which has no end*,” as is the case in certain refined

* This suppression of their names Benson ascribes to the delicacy of the Apostle. And he illustrates it from several other examples (See his note); though probably, as on many other occasions, he carries his speculations too far. He refers to a fine passage of this kind in Ignat. Ep. ad Smyr. § 5.

discussions which arise out of such questions (so Milton: "and found no end, in wandering mazes lost"); also, "where no end is kept in view or *attained*," consequently *unprofitable, useless*. Either, or *both*, of these significations are here applicable: and Heinr. thinks there is an hendiadis for γεν. μυθώδεσι καὶ ἀπερ.; as Polyb. 9, 2. ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι τὰ περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθος. But the question is, what is meant by the γενεαλ.; on which the modern Commentators are not agreed. Some say the *Cabalistical Fables*. Others, as Hamm., Le Clerc, Grot., and Benson, the *Æons* of the Gnostics and Valentinians. Others, as Schoettg., the proud glorying of the Jews in their genealogies, of which we find vestiges in the New Testament and the earlier Greek writers. See Schoettg., who gives a sort of history of this genealogical study. The two former hypotheses are rightly said by Heinr. to regard latter times. The third, he thinks, is inconsistent with the hatred and contempt borne by the Gentiles to the Jews; and the fourth he considers as little agreeable to the context, since that study could have nothing to do with religion, nor be any hindrance to it." He adopts the exposition of Michaelis and others, who take it of the *doctrines of the Essenes*, on the nature, names, and species of angels. To me it seems that the interpretation of Schoettg., which is supported by the authority of the antients, is the most natural and probable.* As to the objection of Heinr., it appears ill founded. I am aware how hopeless it is to attempt to *decide* a question of such great uncertainty: but I may be permitted to suggest, that possibly the Apostle might have *more than one* of the above kinds of "superstitious vanities" in view.

Rosenm. has the following general observations:

* Wets. understands it of Timothy's *own genealogy*; and last of all, of the *study of National Antiquities*. Interpretations, as well as some others, deserving of no serious attention.

“Videmus inde, jam Apostoli ævo fuisse, qui pro religione inutiles quæstiones proponerent. Tales omnibus temporibus fuerunt, et nunc etiam sunt doctores; qui utinam perpenderent, quàm graviter peccent, quod summa religionis optimæ et utilissimæ neglecta, auditoribus commenta humana, nihil ad virtutem et salutem profutura, inculcare solent.”

4. αἵτινες ζητήσεις παρέχουσι μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκοδομίαν Θεοῦ τ. ε. π. This shows the *reason* why they should not be attended to; namely, since they afforded matter for ζητήσεις, *curious questions*, such as those in which the Orientals have always delighted, mere *logomachies*. See 6, 4. 2 Tim. 2, 14. and Tit. 3, 9. For ἡ οἰκοδομίαν Θεοῦ, many MSS., the Syriac and Coptic Versions, and some Fathers and Greek Commentators, read οἰκονομίαν, which is preferred by Matth., Griesb., Vater, and Valpy; but (I think) on insufficient grounds. The words are so very similar that the authority of MSS., and therefore of Versions, is of no weight. The question must be decided by the context: and certainly here οἰκοδ. yields the preferable sense, namely, “that which promotes such edification as is acceptable to God.” As to the other, “that which we render to God as ministers,” it is frigid and far-fetched. And it is in vain to plead the critical canon, “that the more difficult reading is to be preferred,” since *that* is liable to several exceptions; as when two words are so manifestly similar, that it were almost an even chance which a scribe would fix on. In *that* case, surely, the more *uncommon* word is the likeliest to be the true reading; and such undoubtedly is οἰκοδομίαν, a word rarely used in the best writers (hence the οἰκοδομήν of the Cod. Cant. and other *altered* MSS.); whereas οἰκοδομία is of perpetual occurrence, both in the New Testament and the Classical writers.

It is plain that μᾶλλον ἢ is for καὶ οὐ; as often in Thucyd. and the best writers.

5. τὸ δὲ τέλος—ἀνυποκρίτου. The connection is ably traced by Crell. thus; “Subjungit Apostolus

scopum et obrussam omnium mandatorum, ad quam exigendæ sint omnes doctrinæ, ex quâ judicium fieri posset de unaquaque doctrinâ, ut quæ cum illa discrepet infecta et aliena censeatur; q. d. “ Ut autem scias, o Timothee, veram a suppositiâ doctrinam dignoscere, scito Charitatem esse veluti scopum et cynosuram, quam omnia Dei mandata respiciant, ita ut quicquid cûm ea conveniat, pro genuino sit agnoscendum, quicquid autem discrepet, repudiandum sit, Charitas erga proximum videlicet.” Theodoret traces it thus: Δείξας τῆς ἐκείνων μυθολογίας τὸ ἀκερδὲς, προὔθεικε τῆς οἰκείας διδασκαλίας τὸ χρήσιμον. προσήκει γὰρ σε, φησι, διδάσκειν αὐτοῦς εἰλικρινῶς ἀγαπᾶν τὸν εὐεργέτην Θεόν, καὶ πίστιν ἔχειν ἀκραιφνή, τῇ τοῦ συνειδότος μαρτυρίᾳ βεβαιουμένην.

Τῆς παραγγελίας is taken by Benson for ταύτης παραγγ.; with reference to the ἵνα παραγγείλῃς at ver. 3.; but erroneously. It must be taken for τοῦ παραγγέλματος: and that for τῶν παραγγελμάτων. It is explained by Crellius: “ the system or body of all the commandments to whose observance we are bound. See Joh. 6, 29. The ἀγάπη must be taken in its full extent of signification, including love *both to God and man*, and, as Crell. truly, but quaintly, remarks, non tam in *affectu* quam in *effectu*. (See Matt. 22, 37—40.) A virtue (as Heinr. says) the head and fountain of all the other Christian virtues. See Mark 12, 30. 1 Cor. 13. And see the note on Gal. 5, 6.

In the ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας and συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς, it is not necessary to seek refinements, for Crell. has too minutely discussed their sense. They are rather to be taken *populariter*, as designating a candid, sincere, and well meaning spirit. To the Classical examples adduced I add Theogn. Sentent. 89. ἢ με φίλει καθαρὸν θέμενος νόον, ἢ μ' ἀπορειπὼν Ἐχθαιρ' and Pind. Ol. 4, 27. πρὸς ἡσυχίαν φιλόπολιν Καθαρᾶ γνώμα τετραμμένον. By the πιστ. ἀνυποκρίτου, is meant *an undissembled faith*, so firm and real as shall produce the ἀγάπη just mentioned.

6. ὧν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες, ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν, “from which (virtues just mentioned) some have swerved, turning their minds to vain speculations and fruitless discussions.” The Apostle here employs two metaphors, each well adapted to denote deviation from a commandment; namely, 1. a missing of the mark (σκόπου being understood, which is expressed in Plut. Symp. 6, 4.; and this metaphor is used by Plut. 1, 1060. and 2, 414. cited by Wets. ἀστοχ. τοῦ πρόποντος.); 2. a going out of the road ὁδοῦ being understood, which is sometimes supplied, and used metaphorically. See Wetstein’s numerous examples; especially Joseph. Ant. 13, 18. ἐξετραπ. τῆς ὁδοῦ δικαίας). By ματαιολογία (which is adduced by Wets. from Porphyry. de Abst. 4, 16., and by Schleus. from Plato 6, 21.) is meant, the vain speculations and endless and unprofitable discussions mentioned at ver. 3 & 4. Compare 4, 7. 6, 20. 2 Tim. 2, 16. and Tit. 39.

7. θελόντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι—διαβεβαιοῦνται. By the νομοδιδ. are denoted, not (as some suppose) Jewish teachers, but (as the ancients and most moderns are agreed) those Judaizing Christians, who, from φιλαρχία, wished to be teachers of others. And the term νομοδιδάσκαλος, which properly signified a Rabbi, or teacher of the Jewish law, had been, together with many other terms (See Vitranga de Syn. Vet.), introduced into the Gospel; and it is supposed by some (as Heinr.) to have been used for the names by which Christian Rabbis were designated, as ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, and προεστῶτες. But, according to the usual import of θέλειν εἶναι, in St. Paul, I should prefer to suppose, with Benson, Rosenm., and others, that it here signifies, “desiring to be (thought),” *affecting to be*. Perhaps, therefore, the term might mean a Christian teacher, who united instruction in the law to that of the Gospel.

The participle μὴ νοοῦντες (by an idiom found in our own language) is put for the verb and the particle ὅμως, “though they know not;” “not know-

ing." It is a sort of *nominativus pendens*. Now of these persons it is said, that "they understood not what, nor the thing concerning which, they so positively affirm," for such appears to be the sense of the words. That διαβεβαιούνται must be taken as a deponent, is plain from the antithetical λέγουσι. And so it is used in Tit. 3, 8. περὶ τούτων βούλομαι δε διαβεβαιούσθαι. also Plut. 1, 184. (cited by Wets.) περὶ τῶν Α. πραγμάτων διαβεβαιούμενος. Sext. Emp. : περὶ οὐδενὸς τῶν λεχθησομένων διαβεβαιούμεθα. and Polyb. (cited by Schleus.) : διαβεβ. περὶ τούτων. The sense above laid down is that approved by the most eminent Commentators antient and modern. (See Theophyl., Whitby, and Benson.) Schleus. 1, 592. renders thus: "nec tamen intelligentes, neque qua loquuntur, neque quid affirmant et defendant, aut quibus argumentis se tueantur." But this would require περὶ to be taken in a very uncommon sense.

8. οἶδαμεν δὲ—χρήται. It is well remarked by Theodoret, that the Apostle says this in order that he might not seem to depreciate the law; q. d. "I find no fault with the *law*, but with the *evil teachers of the law*." Δὲ, *autem*. Οἶδαμεν, "we well know and admit." In what sense the law is said to be *good*, and what is meant by the using it *lawfully*, Commentators are not agreed, nor do they see their way very clearly. It is mostly agreed that by καλὸν is meant, good and useful in its nature, intent, and meaning. That such was the Mosaic law, ceremonial and moral, none can doubt: but the Apostle seems to have had *chiefly* in view the *moral* part of it, which was so entirely καλὸν, that it was worthy of being engrafted into the "new and better law."

With respect to the phrase νομιμῶς χρῆσθαι, it is explained in two ways by the antients; 1. of teaching and fulfilling it in works; 2. of making use of it to lead us to Christ and the Gospel; which is the scope of the law. But of neither of these interpretations can I entirely approve; though both are, to a certain degree, true. As to νομιμῶς, it is used for

paronomasia, and simply signifies *aright*. The only use of the law that the Apostle could think or pronounce to be right, was the fulfilling its moral precepts, and strengthening their observance from the powerful motives supplied by the Gospel, and thus making it lead to Christ.

9, 10. εἰδὼς τοῦτο—ἀνυποτάκτοις. On the scope of the Apostle, and the sense of this passage Commentators, both antient and modern, have been little agreed. But I need not enter into the numerous diversities, (for a detail of which the reader is referred to Walch Diss. on this passage, Goetting. 1776.); since I conceive the only interpretation that bears the stamp of truth is that of Walch and Rosenm., which had been partly discovered by the antients and also by Crellius and others, by which νόμον is understood, not of the moral law in general (of offices and duties), but the minatory and penal part of it, levelled against murders, thefts, adulteries, &c. “The Judaizing Christians (says Slade), in the excess of their zeal for the law, had overlooked one of its great objects—the punishment and prevention of sin; and it is probable that the Apostle merely designed to correct this error, reminding them that the severe enactments of the moral law, for which they were so strenuous, *do not* concern (οὐ κείται) or apply to those who have a Christian love of righteousness, *are of force* only against such as contemn and violate the law.” So Doddr. concludes that it chiefly relates to crimes and punishments. And he adds, that the genius of Christianity is so sublime, and the character of Christians in general (at that time) was so good, that there was no need of insisting on legal sentences denounced against such enormities, in order to keep them in the course of their duty.” Whether this *last* observation be well founded I have some doubt: indeed the whole passage is too obscure to permit us to be positive as to its sense.

Κείται is frequently used in this sense by the best

Classical writers; of which the philological Commentators adduce examples in superfluous abundance. They also (especially Pricæus and Wets.) adduce many parallel sentiments; though none quite to the purpose.

The general terms ἀνόμοις and ἀνοποτάκτοις (which denote *disobedient to orders*), are followed by the *special* ones ἀσέβεισι, &c. in which it is not necessary to seek refinements. The whole may be regarded as expressed (and to be taken) *populariter*. With respect to the general term ἁμαρτωλοῖς, some, wondering that this general term should be inserted among special ones, would take it to denote *idolaters*. An interpretation which Heinr. rightly rejects, adding that the Apostle does not heed such niceties, but occasionally intermixes special terms with general ones. Here, however, this apology is unnecessary. It should rather seem that the Apostle employed ἁμαρτ. after ἀσεβ., since the words were commonly, and almost proverbially, *united*, in the sense *exceedingly sinful*. So Prov. 11, 31. ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλός where the Hebr. is עשׂר and שׂוּר. Joel 1, 15. ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. See also 1 Pet. 4, 18.

The next terms ἀνοσίους and βεβήλους are nearly synonymous. So Hesych. explains ἀνοσία by βέβηλα, ἄδικα, ἄνομα. Ἀνόσιος denotes one who despises and transgresses all laws, divine and human. βέβηλος denotes properly an irreligious person, one who is not a worshipper or participator in any religious worship. So Hesych.: βέβηλος, ἀνέρος, ἀμίαντος. Such persons were so called, as being excluded from the sacred fanes. Thus the term may here have the sense *heathenish*, in our popular acceptation.

Ἀνδροφόνοις. E. V. *man-slayers*. Doddr., *assassins*. But neither words convey the right idea. It may be better rendered *murderers* (in general), including both open and secret violence, and also that less criminal, because not deliberate, mode of taking another's life, called *manslaughter*, or homicide.

Πόρνοι is commonly rendered *whoremongers* or *fornicators*. But it may also denote *adulterers*. Some recent Commentators explain it *male prostitutes*; comparing I Cor. 5, 9—11. 6, 9. Hebr. 12, 16. 13, 4. Perhaps the Apostle might have all these senses in view; though the list is not complete; since the Apostle adds καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον, &c.

By ἀνδραποδισταῖς the best Commentators are agreed is meant, those who kidnapped and sold into slavery free persons. Now this was regarded by the law as felony of the deepest dye, and was always punished with death. And as all the crimes here mentioned are of the most heinous kind, and as robbery does not elsewhere occur in the list, so ἀνδροποδ. seems as put for robbery of the worst sort. Let, then, the slave-traders (Christians, alas!) of our times tremble! for *all* who, in *any way*, participate in that abominable traffic are ἀνδραποδισταί; since they thereby uphold a system which perpetually *engenders man-stealing*. The terms ψεύσται and ἐπίορκοι require no explanation. Φευστ. denotes *deceit, perfidy* of the basest sort. Compare ἄσυνθετοί, ἄσπόνδοι, at Rom. 1, 31. Ἐπίορκ. denotes *perjury*. Against *all* the foregoing crimes there had been severe penalties denounced in the Mosaic law; and the Commentators especially give references to those parts of the Pentateuch supposed to be here alluded to. But that the Apostle had *also* in view the still more terrible denunciations against these sins in the *Gospel*, is plain from the words following, καὶ εἴ τι—κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, &c. The metaphor in ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία was frequent in the best writers to denote *true, right*, &c. So Plut. 2, 20. (cited by Wets.) αὐταὶ γὰρ εἰσιν ὑγιαίνουσαι περὶ θεῶν δόξαι καὶ ἀληθεῖς. and Philo p. 32, 29. τοὺς ὑγιαίνοντας λόγους. Wets. has here also cited two similar *lists of crimes*; as Pollux 6, 151. (in which are the ἀνδροποδίσται and the πόρνοι, πατραλῶαι, and μητραλῶαι.) and Philostr. 4, 7. μοιχοὶ καὶ ἀνδραποδισταί, πόρνοι—καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔθνη. The learned Commentator might have added Phi-

lostr. Epist. Apoll. 66. κλεπτῆς τε καὶ ληστῆς, καὶ ἀνδαποδιστῆς, καὶ εἴ τις ἄδικος ἢ ἱερόσυλος.

11. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ, ὁ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ. The κατὰ signifies *in conformity to, agreeably to*, i. e. with reference to the sound doctrine. Τῆς δόξης. Genitive substantive for an Adjective. With respect to the epithet μακάριος, applied to the Deity here, and at 6, 15., it is observed by Heinr. that no Hebrew word (not even בָּרַךְ) quite corresponds to it. And he thinks it is derived from the Homeric μακάριοι Θεοὶ αἰεὶ ἔοντες. But it should seem very improbable that the Apostle ever read Homer; nor is it necessary to have recourse to such a supposition. We may easily imagine, that the term, in this use, was not unfrequent in the mouths of the educated classes. Thus Philo 147. (cited by Loesn.), among other predicates of God, names him μόνον μακάριον.

On the idiom in ὁ ἐπιστ. ἐγώ, see the note on Rom. 3, 12.

12. καὶ χάριν—εἰς διακονίαν. Τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με X. I., “to Christ Jesus that strengthened me (to the effectual preaching of this Gospel).” The sense of these words is unwarrantably *lowered* by Rosenm. and Koppe thus: “instruxit me, ut scirem quid docerem, et libenter et constanter docerem.” They will not allow that there can be any reference to miraculous power. Though this is supported by the antients, and many eminent moderns, as Benson and Michaelis, the former of whom refers to Acts 1, 8., where δύναμις is used, on the Holy Spirit being promised to the *Apostles of the circumcision*. “Thereby (says he) was signified all that *illumination* and miraculous *power* which enabled them to understand the Gospel, and to spread it with success. All this St. Paul received, not from man, neither by men, but immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ. Acts 9, 17., Rom. 15, 19., 2 Cor. 3, 5. and 6., Gal. 1, 1., 11 and 12.” Πιστόν. In the same sense the word occurs in Hebr. 2, 17. Heinr.

remarks that θέμενος is for ὡς τιθέσθαι με. Rosenm. takes it for ὅτι ἔθετο με. Διακονίαν is put for τὴν διακονίαν, scil. τῆς καινῆς διαθηκῆς, 2 Cor. 3, 6. It is here observed by Rosenm. : “ Digressio hæc a v. 12. ad 17., non cohæret cum officiis quæ Paulus Timotheo in superioribus præscribit; sed quia præstantiæ religionis christianæ mentionem fecerat, obiter commemorat vocationem suam, et felicem se prædicat, quod dignus esset habitus, cui Christus tantum munus doctoris evangelici concederet, quod non amplius esset Judæus, sed Christi Apostolus.

13. τὸν πρότερον—ὑβριστήν. Βλάσφημον, an evil speaker, detracter. A term used generally of revilers of *men*, but κατ' ἐξοχὴν, of those who insult the *Deity*. See Acts 26, 11., and the note. I would subaud τῆς καινῆς διαθηκῆς, scil. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, from the preceding verse. On διακτὴν, see Gal. 1, 13. Ὑβριστήν (on which see Heinr.) is a stronger term, and seems to denote the persecuting spirit carried into *effect* in the personal violence used by Saul to apprehend and bring Christians to punishment. See Acts 8, 3 & 11., 9, 2.

13. ἀλλ' ἐλέγθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ. There is some harshness in the ἀπιστία added at the end of the sentence, without which all would have been clear. Some, as Rosenm., take it for ἐν χρόνῳ τῆς ἀπιστίας. But this is too arbitrary. Heinr. thinks the ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ is exegetical of the ἀγνοῶν; and he renders: “ per imprudentiam, quippe qui, ἀπιστος ὢν, adeoque de veritate quondam edoctus, in honorem Jovæ, veræque, ut errabam, Mosaicæ religionis infesto odio persequabar perfidos et quasi perfugas Christianos.” Benson paraphrases: “ as I then acted out of ignorance; and opposed Christianity, because I did not believe, nor suspect, it to be true.*

* He remarks that “ *sincerity* is used in two senses; 1., For a man's carefully inquiring into the nature and extent of his duty, and habitually acting accordingly. 2., For a man's acting according to his present sentiments; though he has not formerly inquired into the nature and extent of his duty, with the care which he might, and ought to have used. St. Paul, before his conversion to

It should seem that the obscurity arose from the Apostle's here blending (as not unfrequently) two clauses into one; q. d. "I obtained mercy because my unbelief was sincere, though resting on false grounds; and, therefore, what I did was under ignorance of the true nature of my conduct."

14. ὑπερεπλεόνασε—Ἰησοῦ. The sense of these words is somewhat obscure, from brevity; but it seems to be this: "The mercy and favour of God was so abundant to me, as not only to pardon my unbelief and blasphemy, but to bring me to the Christian faith; and that with the most affecting condescension." Such, I conceive, is the full and real sense, which has been imperfectly conceived and expressed by Commentators.

15. This verse is, in some respects, parenthetical. Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος. These words are rendered by Wets. thus: "Certissima res est, et digna quam omni studio, et cupidè omnes amplectantur probentque." The literal sense is as follows: "assuredly true and worthy of entire acceptance is the position, that, &c. So Thucyd. 3, 63, 1., ἀξιώτερος πάσης ζημίας. Apollon. Epist. 12., τοὺς ἀξίους ἀποδοχῆς. Diog. Laert. 5, 64., ἀνὴρ γέγονε πολλῆς τῆς ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος. With the πιστὸς λόγος Koppe compares the Hebr. כִּשְׁתָּהּ הַדָּבָר. The same expression occurs in 3, 1., 2 Tim. 2, 11., and Tit. 3, 8. There is here (as I have before indicated) a slight hyperbaton. Λόγος, *assumption, position, doctrine*; as Matt. 9, 13., Mark 2, 17., and Luke 6, 32. The above sense of ἀποδοχὴ is established and illus-

Christianity, was not sincere, in the former sense. For if he had first carefully inquired into the nature and evidence of Christianity, a man of his fairness of mind would not have persecuted the Christians, but have readily become one himself. But, in the latter sense of the word, he was *sincere*, i. e. he honestly acted according to his present sentiments. And, being ignorant of the nature and evidence of Christianity, and a real unbeliever, who took it for granted that Christianity was false, he thought it his duty to oppose it, and to persecute those who professed it."

trated by the Philological Commentators with examples in superfluous abundance.

15. *σωσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς*. Benson explains "to reform sinners;" and he adduces several examples. But this seems to be a groundless refinement. Even Koppe (though sufficiently prone to innovation) acknowledges that it is one of those general phrases denoting all the merits of Christ in effecting the salvation of men. Now the *end* of Christ's coming was not only to put men into the *way of salvation* in this world, but to contribute every necessary aid, consistent with the free will of moral agents, towards their obtaining the *end*, even salvation and eternal happiness in another. *Ἀμαρτωλοὺς*, "(all) sinners as well as myself;" and indeed all *men*, since all are sinners. It is observed, by Theophyl., that this is levelled against the Judaizers, to show them that without faith it is impossible to be saved.

Ἐγὼ πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ. At this strong expression some modern Commentators stumble; and many, both antient and modern, enter into needless doctrinal subtleties. The attempt to remove the seeming harshness by altering the sense (as does Benson) into, "I am the first who from a blasphemer and persecutor have become a Christian," can be approved by no one who has any accurate perception of the force of Greek phraseology. And it is in vain to say that the words of the next verse *require* it; since there the sense is *engrafted* upon this; and the Apostle delights in variety. The exposition of the *antients* has been, with reason, retained by all the most eminent modern Commentators: and it is not necessary to rigorously press on the sense, which may be interpreted conformably with a similar expression of exemplary modesty at 1 Cor. 15, 9., where see the note. I have sometimes thought *πρωτος* might mean *one of the chief*; and such, I find, is the opinion of Mr. Valpy. The word has frequently that sense. So especially Eph. 6, 2., *ἐν-*

τολὴ πρώτη, “a primary commandment.” where see note.

16. ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο—αἰώνιον. Koppe well points out the resumptive force in ἀλλὰ ἤλ., which refers to the ἀλλ’ ἡλεήθην at ver. 13. ; q. d. “For this reason, I say, I was spared.” Ἴνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρῶτῳ ἐνδείξῃται—μακροθυμίαν. The πρῶτῳ has reference to the πρῶτος of the former verse, but with a variation of sense ; q. d. “I was the first of sinners, and therefore in me *first* (of all who had so sinned) did Christ shew mercy.” Others take πρῶτῳ for πρότερον ; and most moderns think that it has the very same signification as πρῶτος at ver. 15. But the sense above laid down seems the more natural, and agreeable to the style of the Apostle, who delights in variety. He might, however, in a certain sense, be said to be such. See Benson.

16. τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν, *abundant*. A signification common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν—αἰώνιον, “That I should be an example to all that should come after, that they may believe in him, unto everlasting salvation.” Ὑποτύπωσις properly signifies a slight delineation of any thing in outline, literally a *chalking out* any thing faintly (ὑπὸ) ; and as such sketches or models were used by painters and architects, so the term came to mean an *exemplar* in general. Hence it is explained by the antients ὑπόδειγμα, σημεῖον. By others, παράκλησιν. But this latter, though not inapplicable, cannot be supposed to be the sense had in view by the Apostle. The πιστεύειν depends upon ὥστε ; and the εἰς signifies *end*, i. e. “in order to the attainment of.” See 1 Pet. 1, 9., More *might* be said ; but it is scarcely necessary. The reader may consult Benson, &c.

17. τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων ἀφθάρτῳ. The Apostle here breaks out into an ejaculation of ardent gratitude for the mercy of God ; and concludes the passage (as often) with a Doxology,

one of the grandest and most energetic to be found in all his Epistles.

Βασιλεὺς is frequently applied to *God* as being King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. Βασιλ. τῶν αἰώνων is explained, by the best Commentators, *the King* who hath ruled throughout all ages, and of whose dominion there will be no end. Koppe compares, from the Jewish writers מלך העולם רב עולמים. Other interpretations have been brought forward by Grot. and Hamm., but too far-fetched.

Ἀφθάρτω, *immortal*. So in 6, 16. God is said to be thus distinguished from earthly Kings and fictitious Deities; Ἀοράτω, *unseen* (except by his works). So 6, 16. “dwelling in a light unapproachable by man.” See also Rom. 1, 20. This has been more than once imitated by Milton. The epithet σοφῶ, conjoined also with μόνω, is applied to God by many writers. Yet some Critics maintain that it is supposititious, and introduced from Rom. 16, 27. But the MSS. in which this omission is found are only about six in number, and those altered ones. And it may be easily accounted for, from the wish of the *librarii* to remove what seemed a defect in style; though that arose from misapprehension of the true construction of the sense, which has (I think) been rightly laid down by Bp. Middleton thus: “to the eternal King, the immortal, invisible, and only wise God.” And so some of the antients. On the other hand, it is not so easy to account for its *introduction*, and that into nearly *all* the MSS. Besides, if the construction be what Bp. Middleton has pointed out, the σοφῶ is almost indispensable.

Of these different epithets see the copious Classical examples of Wets.

18. ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν—στρατείαν. Almost all Commentators are agreed that the Apostle is here resuming what he had been saying at ver. 3—7., between which and the present verse there is an interval somewhat protracted, but not so as to induce me to suppose (as some do) that by τὴν παραγ-

γελίαν the Apostle means the injunction he just *after* subjoins. On παραγγελία see Luke 12, 48. and the note. Rosenm. remarks on the transposition of ἵνα, and lays down the following construction: ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σε προφητείας; the words ἐν αὐταῖς being redundant. See a similar transposition at 2 Cor. 2, 4. and Col. 4, 17. The sense is: "This I especially enjoin upon you, that conformably to the preceding predisposition concerning you, ye would diligently discharge your duty and office." At the words κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σε προφητείας modern Commentators have much stumbled. Hence the variety of interpretations, the most specious of which is that of those (as Noesselt and Schleus.) who take προφ. for παραγγελία, διδασκαλία, and παράκλησις, i. e. "according to my previous exhortations." But no example of such a sense of προφητεία has ever been produced; and *thus*, too, the ἐπὶ σε will have an uncommon sense, and προαγ. be very harsh. The interpretation, indeed, has no semblance of truth. As little can I approve of that of Heinr., who takes the προφ. of the *good hope* which all had conceived of Timothy (see Acts 16, 2.), "augurantes eum optimum fore religionis doctorem et defensorem." A sense unauthorized by the usus loquendi: and the phrase savours rather of the *Classical* modes of thought than those of the Apostle. As to other interpretations, I must omit them. There seems no reason to desert the antient and generally received one, by which the προαγούσας ἐπὶ σε προφητείας is taken to signify the *prophecies* respecting Timothy, which preceded his investiture with the office of Evangelist; the προφ. being understood of declarations proceeding from persons who possessed the Divine χάρισμα called the προφητεία. See Acts 13, 2. 20, 28. And so Chrys. and Theophyl. No well founded objection has ever been made to this interpretation, which surely involves no more difficulty than the supposing the existence of the προφητεία so often mentioned in St.

Paul's Epistles, and which, whoever would doubt, may as well close the Bible, and shut his eyes at once upon all truth.

The expression ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν as applied to the vigilant and zealous exercise of his duties, is one of those military metaphors so frequent in the Apostle's writings. See Tim. 2, 3. and Eph. 6, 10. Heinrichs compares a similar use of the Heb. שָׂרָא at Is. 40, 20. and Job 7, 1.* The Hellenism in στρατ. στρ. is of perpetual occurrence. See Wetstein's examples.

19. ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνειδήσιν, "having and holding," &c.; for κατεχ., as often. Πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνειδήσιν Rosenm. takes for πίστιν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, by a sort of hendiadis. But the terms are better kept separate; as supra ver. 5. ἐκ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀ. These (as Hein. observes) are the principal virtues of the Christian soldier. Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: ἀλλὰ δεῖ σε ἔχειν πίστιν, ὥστε τὸν λόγον ὀρθοτομεῖν, καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνειδήσιν, τουτέστι, πολιτείαν ἀκατάγνωστον κεκτῆσθαι. Ἐκ γὰρ ταύτης ἡ ἀγαθὴ συνειδήσις, ἵνα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων δύνασαι προϊστασθαι. So Grot.: "Sicut ignis pabulo indiget, ita fides bonis operibus; alioqui facile extinguitur. Nam qui malè agere volunt, omnia quærunt ut sibi persuadeant ea quæ de præmiis ac pænis æternis dicuntur non esse vera, aut certè non tali Lege Deum agere cum hominibus."

19. ἣν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι, "which (good conscience) some having rejected and neglected," &c.† Περὶ

* Nor was this confined to the Scriptural writers; for, as Wets. observes, omne studium cujuscunque privati aut publici muneris egregiè militia dictum; as Seneca Ep. 96. Vivere—militare est. Max. Tyr. 19, 4. στρατηγὸν μὲν τὸν θεόν, στρατείαν δὲ τὴν ζωὴν, ὀπλίτην δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Apulej. Met. 11. Da nomen huic sanctæ militiæ, cujus olim sacramento etiam lætaberis, teque jam nunc obsequio religionis nostræ dedica, et ministerii jugum subi voluntarium.

† Benson fancies here a reproof of the Judaizing Christians, who neither retained the pure Christian faith, without adding Jewish mixtures, nor a good conscience: for they suppressed what they

τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν. The terms *ναυαγεῖν naufragium facere alicujus* are used by the best Classical writers. See the philological Commentators. But the Latin phrase is confined to ruin of property, or fortune. The other is sometimes used (as here) of a loss of truth, or rectitude by, (as it were,) splitting on the rocks of error or vice. So (of Wets. examples) Cebes : *ναυαγοῦσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ καὶ πλανῶνται*. Galen : *ἐν οἷς γὰρ ἐναυάγησαν οἱ πρόσθεν ἰατροί*. Philo 1, 678. *ναυαγήσαντες ἢ περὶ γλώτταν ἄθυρον, ἢ περὶ γάστρεα ἀπληστον*.

20. ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος. From the mode in which those persons are mentioned, it is plain that there were *more*, and that these are specified as being the most culpable. The names occur at 2 Tim. 2, 17. 2 Tim. 4, 14. Acts 19, 33.; though it has been thought doubtful whether they were the same persons. Hymenæus denied the resurrection of the dead, understanding the resurrection as merely a *spiritual* one, a new birth unto righteousness.

20. οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ. See the note on 1 Cor. 5, 5. Ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν. It is strange that Heinr., who discusses this passage with his usual learning and acuteness, should regard this as put for *μηδερμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ τοῦ βλασφημεῖν*. Or they may, he thinks, be explained "ex affectu irati, qui sæpissime minatur plura quàm efficere aut potest aut in animo habet." And he remarks on the *immitia verba* of St. Paul. But surely nothing more irreverent to the Apostle can be imagined! As to the reasons assigned by Heinr. for deviating from the common opinion, they are too weak to deserve a moment's attention. Good sense and good taste (if nothing more) might have taught him not to press or refine on the sense of such words, which Pricæus long ago showed are to be reckoned among proverbial expressions. And he

knew to be truth, and, to please the Jews, broached what was erroneous and destructive of the Gospel."

adduces many examples from various authors. In all such passages, it may be observed, the true *end* of all punishment is *supposed* to be aimed at, namely, the *prevention of crime*. Hence we may see how false is the interpretation of Beza, “ne impunè ferant suas blasphemias.”

The force of βλασφ. may easily be conceived by considering that those who propounded such heresies as did Hymenæus, could scarcely avoid speaking evil of the truth; and, as Grot. observes, those who abandon any doctrine, and promulgate an opposite one, usually seek to justify their conduct by speaking evil of the one they have forsaken.

Whether Hymenæus and Alexander *were* thus reclaimed, we are not informed. Most probably *not*. See Benson. How much! this uncompromising severity to apostates strengthens our confidence in the divine mission of the Apostles, is justly remarked by Reynolds ap. Doddr.

CHAP. II.

It is truly observed by Benson, that c. 1. is a sort of preface to the whole Epistle; and at c. 2. the Apostle enters upon particulars, and proceeds to give Timothy directions for the regulation of the Church, and especially as regards its *external state*. Hence he first touches upon the most important of the external observances, public prayer.

VERSE 1. *πρώτον πάντων* is by some interpreted *imprimis*. But the context requires *primum omnium*, with the Vulg. And so Luke 12, 1. 2 Pet. 1, 20. Like *principio*, it often has no apodosis.

The terms *προσευχαί*, *ἐντεύξεις*, and *εὐχαριστία* have *properly* this difference, that by the first is meant *deprecations of evil*; by the second, *supplications for good*; by the third, *intercession for others*; by the fourth, *grateful acknowledgments to the Di-*

vine goodness :* but I agree with the best Commēn-tators, that we need not here resort to critical distinctions (which even the antients disapproved). Thus Theophyl., from Chrys., says: *τινες δὲ διαφορὰν περιειργάσαντο*), but understand the terms as denoting *all kinds* of prayers to be offered up for the good of men, and which may be variously classed.

By *πάντων* are meant both Christians, and non-Christians. Some add, both friends and enemies. But *that* seems little consistent with *public* prayer. This was, I think with Benson, levelled against the bigotry of the Jews and Gentiles. How different such a course was from the spirit and practice of the *Jews*, and how necessary it was to show the Gentiles the difference of Christians in this respect, is very obvious. They might, by praying for, rather than by evincing contempt and hatred for the Heathens, and especially by prayers for the prosperity of kings and governors, show that, as loyal, peaceable, and well-affected subjects, they deserved to be protected rather than persecuted.

2. *ὕπὲρ βασιλέων—όντων*. This may be understood not only of the Roman Emperors, to whom the formerly odious name *βασιλεῖς* began to be freely applied, but to all those who exercised any *sovereign* authority under them, whether Tetrarchs, or others. The *τῶν ἐν ὑπερόχῃ ὄντων* are supposed to be the same with the *οἱ ἐν τέλει*, &c. of the Classical writers, all those bearing the high offices of state and administration of provinces, whether pro-consuls, or ministers of state, &c. So Tertullian in his Apolog. : “Oramus etiam pro Imperatoribus, per ministros eorum, et Potestatibus.” The *Jews*, indeed, as Ottius here shows from Joseph. B. J. 2, 17, 2. and

* Wets. thinks that the *δέησις*, *προσευχή*, and *ἐντεύξις* have this difference, that the first denotes *oratio extemporanea et brevis*; the second, *meditatio majestatis divinæ ejusque adoratio*; the third, *μετὰ πλείονος παρρησίας* (as Origen de Orat. 44. defines), *vel de certâ quadam re Deum adire*.

Ant. 12, 11. "did profess to pray twice a day for the emperors : and the Rabbis directed the people to pray *pro pace regni*. But the present practice of the Jews was so little consistent with their professions, that it was the more necessary for the Christians to show how different *they* themselves were in both respects. This duty (so agreeable to the precepts of Christ, Matt. 22, 21., and to the spirit of the Gospel) was (we find from the early Ecclesiastical writers here cited by the Commentators) universally performed by the primitive Christians.

The words *ἵνα διάγωμεν* Heinr. says, are very plain. Yet he seems to misunderstand their general scope : for the sense (I apprehend) is *not*, "let us do this that we may live at peace, and not suffer persecution," but I think with Rosenm., that these *prayers* (which included all the lesser observances of loyal subjects,) are directed to be offered up for the benefit of that quietness and deliverance from the harassings of barbarians and Robbers, than which no greater blessing can be received by subjects from rulers. Here Wets., and especially Pricæus, adduce Classical examples in superfluous abundance ; but very few indeed are useful or apposite.*

The *σεμνότης*. denotes a decorous and worthy demeanour : a signification found in the Classical writers. So Herodian 2, 1, 10. (cited by Wets.) *διὰ σεμνότητα αἰδουμένος*, "respected for his worth." Ælian. V. H. 2, 13. *σεμνότης βίου*.

* I could contribute no slight symbola ; but shall content myself with three or four passages which did not occur to those Commentators, and are really apposite. Thucyd. 4, 62. *τὴν δὲ ὑπὸ πάντων ὁμολογουμένην ἄριστον εἶναι εἰρήνην πῶς οὐ χρὴ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ποίησασθαι ; ἢ δοκεῖτε, εἰ τῷ τι ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν ἢ εἰ τῷ τὰ ἐναντία, οὐχ ἡσυχία μᾶλλον ἢ πόλεμος τὸ μὲν παύσαι ἂν ἐκατέρω, τὸ δὲ συνδιασώσαι, καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καὶ λαμπρότητας ἀκινδυνότερας ἔχειν τὴν εἰρήνην, ἄλλα τε ὅσα ἐν μήκει λόγων ἂν τις διέλθοι, ὥσπερ περὶ τοῦ πολεμεῖν.* Pind. Pyth. 7. init. (which Thucyd. seems to have had in view), *φίλοφρον' Ἀσυχία, Δικὰς ὦ μεγατόπολι θύγατερ.* Cicero : *Nihil tam populare quam concordiam quam otium reperiemus.* Theophyl. Sim. 77 D. *οὐδὲν γὰρ τῆς εἰρήνης καθέστηκε τιμαλφέστερον τοῖς γε νοῦν ἔχουσι.*

3, 4. τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν—Θεοῦ, “For this (i. e. praying for all men, especially rulers,) is good,” &c. The καλὸν seems to regard *men*. (So Theophyl. τὸ φύσει καλὸν),* and is rendered by Rosenm. *pulcrum*, *honestum*, *quod decet*. Ἀποδεκτὸν signifies properly what is *worthy* of being accepted or approved: but it here denotes what *is* approved. It is explained by Hesych. ἐπαινετόν. We may compare Hebr. 13, 21. ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ εὐάρεστον. By πάντας is meant *all nations* and all individuals, q. d. “God desires the salvation of all, and therefore for all we are bound to *pray*.” Thus the term σωτήρ ἡμῶν, often elsewhere applied to God (see the note on 1, 1.) has here a peculiar propriety. On σωθῆναι see the note supra 1, 15. The καὶ before εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν is well rendered by Benson *and in order thereto*. I cannot agree with Doddr. that this clause proves the preceding one must be taken with limitation.

4. εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας signifies, “to perfectly know, and consequently embrace, the truth as it is in Jesus, the true religion, as revealed by Jesus Christ and his Legates.” This sense of ἀληθεία and ΠΩΣ is common in Scripture. That God wishes the salvation of all men, we find from various parts of the New Testament. See Joh. 3, 17. 2 Pet. 3, 9. &c. And this is *implied* in innumerable passages. I cannot however here enter into the subject, which, indeed, falls rather within the province of the Theologian than the Commentator. But I must confess that the *comprehension* of the question seems to far exceed all human power.† That God hath made *sufficient* provision for the salvation of all men, and that none will perish but by their *own fault*, we may be content to believe and know; though the *mode*, &c. must be left in the bosom of our Father and our God.

* In a similar way δίκαιον is used at Eph. 6, 1. where Theophyl. explains, φύσει δίκαιον.

† Mackn. indeed avoids the difficulty; but it is by ascribing an unwarrantable sense to the words.

5, 6. Heinr. here remarks: "Amplificatur hic locus, cur pro omnibus sint noncupanda vota." And so Benson. This may be true; but it seems to me that the Apostle also intended to further explain what was only darkly hinted at in the *καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνω-σιν*: and thus the sense will be: "not merely have we all, of whatever nation, the *same God* as our Creator, and the *same Christ* as our Redeemer, but this: There is one God and Mediator common to all; and this mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ constitutes the only means by which we can be brought to the truth, and thereby attain salvation." The words *ὁ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, which are so closely connected with *μεσίτης* (and to similar adjuncts at Hebr. 9, 15. 8, 6. 12, 24.) plainly prove that the Socinian notion of *Mediator* (as only denoting "one who makes known the mind of two parties to each other, and makes an agreement or covenant between them,") is miserably imperfect: for though that is *one part* of a Mediatorial office, yet the true notion of *Christ's* mediation, as given us in the New Testament, includes also *reconciliation* and *atonement*, and giving himself a ransom to God for us; as the words following at the present passage clearly prove. See the note of Whitby, who shows by many extracts from Philo, that such too was the Jewish notion of Mediator.* It is rightly observed by Mackn., that the Apostle means to hint, that Christ's mediation is founded on the *atonement* which he made for our sins, *in his human nature*. For, as Doddr. observes, the words *ἄνθρωπος*

* He thus concludes his able annotation: "So that here it is made the office of Mediator to *procure peace* to the creature from God, to *make atonement* to God, and to be an advocate to *obtain the pardon of sins*; and if Christ our Mediator and Advocate with the Father, was, by virtue of his office, to do this, surely it must be part of his office to appease and reconcile God to us." This view of the subject is fully supported by the antient Fathers and Commentators. See especially Chrysost., and, of the moderns, Bps. Pearson and Bull, and that most excellent and *seasonable* Treatise of Abp. Magee on the Atonement. See also the note on Rom. 5, 8.

I. X. plainly show that it is in his human nature we are to consider him as discharging it." And this perhaps is the best account to be given of the introduction of *ἄνθρωπος*. Though it might *also* be meant (as some say) to shew the humanity as well as Deity of Christ.*

That *learned* Socinians should have caught up this passage (like so many others) to establish a system which requires all means, even the most desperate, to give it any colour, is not surprising: and that the *unlearned* and unstable among them should receive the gloss they offer is natural; and yet, that *any* persons of learning, and, to use the words of the Apostle, οἱ διὰ τὴν ἔξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἔχουσι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ should be induced to take up with it is truly amazing. To omit many other confirmations of the above view of the subject from writers whom they are accustomed to reverence, I would instance the following: Μεσίτης, ὁ εἰρηνόποιος (ut Suidas explicat) qui amicitiam, pacem, et concordiam restituit, et dissidentes reconciliat, *gutes Vernehmen wiederherstellt*. Hoc mediatoris munere functus est Christus, dum mortem toleravit ad veniam peccatorum, v. 6. et declaravit, Deum velle hominibus condonare propter mortem a se toleratam; per doctrinam suam effecit, ut homines favorem Dei optarent, et quærent; quod beneficium est generale, et totius humani generis donum. Rom. 5, 10. 2 Cor. 5, 19. Ἀνθρωπον hic intellige σχήματι εὐεχθέντα ὡς ἄνθρωπον, Phil. 2, 8. (Rosenm.).

6. ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Compare Matt. 20, 28. This shows the *mode* in which the mediation was effected. Ἀντίλυτρον, which seems to be a stronger term than λύτρον, though nearly of the same sense (and indeed Schleus. thinks it synony-

* So Bp. Middleton ap. Slade: "Unless he had been deemed more than man, there would have been no occasion for such an expression. We never find the word *man* so applied to any other person. There is no such phrase as ἄνθρωπος Μωσῆς, or ἄνθρωπος Ἰωάννης."

mous), occurs in a Greek Translator of Ps. 48, 8., and also in Hesych. : ἀντίλυτρον ἀντίδοτον. It might possibly be in some copies of the Sept. in St. Paul's age. On the full force of the term in question, and of the whole passage, see the masterly note of Whitby.

The words following τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίαις are, from their brevity, somewhat obscure, and have been differently interpreted. Rosenm. renders : "hæc est doctrina temporibus suis reservata." By μαρτύριον he understands that brief sum of it now propounded by the Apostle. And, indeed, μαρτύριον does signify *doctrine* ; but that signification seems here little apposite ; and the whole interpretation yields a very frigid sense. That of Heinr., though ingenious, is too contort to deserve attention. For my own part, I see no interpretation so little liable to objection as the commonly received one, which is well expressed by Benson (ap. Slade) thus : "who gave himself as a ransom for many, as the great witness (of the truth of God's word,) appearing in the proper season (1 Tim. 6, 15. Tit. 1, 3.) appointed by God, and signified in the antient Prophets, for his appearing in the flesh, and undergoing such a scene of humiliation and sufferings. Gal. 4, 4. Eph. 1, 10." And this is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators. Thus Theoph. (from Chrys.) takes μαρτύριον for διὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. Or (he adds) ἐφεσημενέων τουτο, φησὶ νῦν, ὅτι ἀντίλυτρον τὸ μαρτύριον λέγω, τουτέστι, τὸ πάθος· ἦλθε γὰρ μαρτυρήσων τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μέχρι θανάτου. He explains καιροῖς ἰδίαις by καιροῖς τοῖς προσήκουσιν· Theodoret and Œcumen. by ἐπιτηδείοις. See Benson.

7. εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, "to the preaching and declaring of which I am appointed." Compare 2 Tim. 1, 11. The parenthetical declaration ἀληθείαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι may be compared with Rom. 9, 1. where see the note. Benson's version, "as I am a Christian, I speak the

truth, and lie not !" is undignified, and indeed not so accurate as the common one. The sense seems to be : " I speak the truth before Christ, ἐνώπιον Χ., as in the presence of Christ." On the κῆρυξ and ἀπόστολος, the long note of Benson may be consulted (though here, as very often, he is too fanciful), and also that of Doddr. Ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. These words are by some, as Camer., Beza, Grot., Pricæus, and most recent Commentators, applied to the *Apostle*, and taken for πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθής, " teaching sound doctrine, without any admixture of false or adulterate ones." By the antients and many moderns they are referred to the *Gentiles*, i. e. " instructing them in faith and truth ;" which Benson thinks an hendiadis for the *true faith*. But see Theophyl.

8. βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. The οὖν is resumptive ; for the Apostle returns to what he was speaking of at ver. 1., namely, public prayer. Benson observes with how much propriety the Apostle introduces this solemn assertion of his Apostolic power, as ambassador from God. Hence the βούλομαι of the Apostle here and at 1 Tim. 5, 14. Tit. 3, 8. may very well be rendered *I desire, wish, direct*. By τοὺς ἄνδρας the best Commentators are agreed is meant, *the men*, as distinguished from the women. See the learned and able note of Benson, who has (I think) proved the point. Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ is admitted by the best Commentators, antient and modern, to be said *emphatically* ; q. d. " not in Jerusalem only, but every where else," i. e. (as Grot. limits it) wherever the place is proper for public prayer. There is reason to think that these assemblies were at Ephesus, Corinth, and probably elsewhere, held at private houses ; and consequently the whole society was divided into *many* such conventicula.

8. ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας. The ἐπαίροντες ὁσίους χεῖρας is only inserted (as the best Commentators say) *ex naturali orantium habitu*. So Apulej. (cited

by Pric.) Hic habitus orantium est, ut manibus in cœlum extensis precemur.* By *ὁσίους* is meant *pure* and *undefiled*; that which is properly applicable only to the *person*, being applied to the *hands*; as is frequent in the Old Testament; as Ps. 26. "I will wash my hands in innocency, and so will come to thy altar." "There is (as Benson says) both an allusion to the raising of the hands in prayer, and the washing them before prayer; which was a *symbolical action*, denoting the purity of intention which should accompany prayer." All this is so plain that it need not be enlarged upon.

It is further directed to be *χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ*. What is meant by the former is clear. Theophyl. explains it: *μνησικακίας καὶ ἐμπαθείας τὸν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν*. And so Œcumen. and Theodoret, and all the earlier modern Commentators, especially Grot., who aptly compares Maimonid. in *Regulis orandi*: "Si quis senserit animum sibi commotum et cor turgens, ne oret, sed quiescat dum mens sit sedata." See Matt. 5, 24. and 6, 15. and the notes. Doddr. however understands it of imprecatory language against their enemies mixed up with their prayers. And he cautions those who join in free prayer not to mingle their own angry and irregular passions with their addresses to God; than which nothing, he justly adds, can be more displeasing to God, reproachful to Christian assemblies, or offensive to persons of a right temper and disposition. This indeed would be transgressing the Apostle's direction in the very worst manner: yet I can hardly think he had it in view. With respect to the

* Here Wets. cites Galen: *ὁσίας χεῖρας εἰς ἡέρα ἀείρας*. Arist. Eccl. 264. *τὰς χεῖρας αἶπειν*. Hor. Carm. 3, 23, 1. *Cœlo supinas si tuleris manus*. To which I add Eurip. Iph. T. 269. *θεοσεβῆς δ' ἡμῶν τις ὢν, Ἀρέσχε χεῖρα, καὶ πρόσενξαι' εἰσιδών*. Aristid. 2, 398 D. *οὐ τὰς χεῖρας ἄνω σὺν αἰδοῦ καὶ δέει συγγνώμην αἰτῆσαι τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε ἡμαρτημένων τοὺς θεοὺς*. Philo Jud. 648 C. *καθαρὶς καὶ παρθένους χεῖρας ἀνατείνας*. Plut. Mar. 26. *ἤνυστο κ. ἀνασχὼν τὰς χεῖρας*.

διαλογισμοῦ, it is explained by some, as Est., Benson, and Heinr., of disputatious contention, debate, and altercation respecting the taking the lead in a congregation (see Rom. 14.), or on the question respecting the reception of the Gentiles. But it can hardly be supposed that they brought such disputes to *prayer*: and therefore I prefer the interpretation of the antients and most moderns, *doubting*. So Theophyl.: ἀμφιβολίαν φησί· τουτέστιν, ἵνα μὴ ἀμφιβόλως καὶ μετὰ δισταγμοῦ προσέρχῃ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύων καὶ μὴ διακρινόμενος, τουτέστιν, ἀμφιβάλλων ὅτι ἢ λήψῃ, ἢ οὐ λήψῃ, ἃ αἰτεῖς. And this, as it is supported by so many passages of Scripture, especially Joh. 1, 6., and (as Doddr. says) “furnishes another important thought on the subject,” seems to deserve the preference.

9, 10. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας—ἀγαθῶν.

Here must be repeated βούλομαι, not (as Grot.) βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι; which is plainly contrary to the Apostle's intention. (Rosenm.) And so most Interpreters, including the E. V., Doddr., and Mackn. But in this there is something awkward; though Mackn. helps it out by supplying, “before appearing in the assemblies for worship:” which is, however, arbitrary and frigid. I cannot but think, with Grot. and other moderns, and all the antients, that the *whole* of the preceding is meant to be repeated: *but* (I would add) with an adaptation of προσεύχεσθαι to the sense required by the context, namely, *silent prayer*: and when the Apostle adds ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, I think he means: “Let them attend the public prayers in modest apparel. And then at the following words μετὰ αἰδοῦς, the βούλομαι must be repeated, with the following sense: “I wish them (I say) to adorn themselves (on such occasions) not in,” &c.

It is strange that Salmas., Koppe, and others, should have taken καταστολὴ in the sense *cohibitio*, which is very frigid and inapposite. It is rightly interpreted by the antients, and almost all moderns, of *apparel*. So Theophyl.: ἀπαιτεῖ τὸ κατασταλεῖσθαι κοσμίως καὶ μὴ περιεργῶς· ἀκοσμία γὰρ ἐκεῖνο. He well explains καταστολὴ thus: Καταστολὴν δὲ λέγει τὸ πάντοθεν περιεσταλῆναι καὶ συγκεκαλύφθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀνακεκαλύφθαι ἀναισχύντως. This the modern Commentators have not attended to: though Hesych. explains it περιβολὴν. The word occurs (among other passages cited by Wets.) in Joseph. and Is. 61, 3. καταστολὴν δόξης, and also Plut. 1, 154. καταστολὴν περιβαλῆς; though it there means *restraint*.

The Apostle then adds, further to explain his meaning, μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσυνῆς κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς. Of these words αἰδοῦς and σωφροσυνῆς the former is said, by the Commentators, to relate to

the countenance and conversation; the latter to the whole demeanour. Here Wets. adduces a vast number of Classical citations, the most apposite of which are the following. Thucyd. 1, 84. αἰδοὺς σωφροσύνης πλεῖστον μετέχει. Arrian Epict. 4, 8. σώφροσύνης, κοσμιότητος καὶ αἰδοὺς ἐραστίας. J. Firmic. 8, 30. verecundia, gravitate morum atque honestâ conversatione ornatos. Xen. Mem. 2. τὸ σῶμα τῇ καθαρότητι κεκοσμημένην, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἰδοῖ, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα σωφροσύνη. But even these are not quite to the purpose; since the expressions are, perhaps, only to be regarded as adverbial phrases for σωφρονῶς, &c.

The words following are further exegetical. The πλέγμ. is explained by Heinr.: "annulus, quo implicantur, aut in cincinnos torquentur crines, unde exiebat ἐμπλοκὴ τριχῶν 1 Pet. 3, 3. Heb. נָשָׂא נָשָׂא, Jes. 3, 24." The χρυσῶν, he thinks, is to be united with the πλέγμασιν by an hendiadis. Wetstein has here brought together such an immense mass of passages illustrative of the words πλέγμασιν and μαργαρίταις as might astonish the most diligent collector; yet they illustrate the subject less than could be supposed, and most of them are superfluous. Of the use of gold in the head-dress, and in other parts of female attire, we need not be told: neither is this a place for minutiae of such a kind. Omitting these, therefore, I shall content myself with some original observations on the passage at large. The best Commentators in these general and positive terms, seek a limitation. Of the various methods pursued, the best is, to take οὐχ—ἀλλὰ in the sense non tam—quam, examples of which are not unfrequent; as Luke 14, 12. Joh. 6, 27. Hos. 6, 6. and 1 Pet. 3, 3. ὢν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἐξῶθεν (ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων, ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων) κόσμος· ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας. So I would point: for the use of καὶ (not ἢ) before περιθέσεως χρυσίων shows that the words are to be taken with the preceding ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν; and if so, they can mean nothing but golden combs, clasps, bands, and other ornaments for the hair, as the learned have conjectured, but not proved. So Thucyd. 1, 6., describes the antient Athenians as χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐνέρσει κρώβυλον ἀναδούμενοι τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν. The πλέγματα* of St. Paul corresponds to the κρωβύλοι of Thucyd.; and they both mean *cincinna*. And, as in the passage of St. Paul, the word χρυσῶν comes immediately after πλέγμασιν, and as the association of ideas would so naturally (as in the case of St. Peter) lead to the mention of those golden ornaments which adorned the hair, I would rather interpret it of these, than of armlets, or ear-rings. Not so with the μαργαρίταις, by which I should understand *finger-rings, armlets, necklaces, ear-*

* Which may be illustrated from Artemid. 4, 73., p. 394., πολλὴν, ἢ ὑπόδησιν, ἢ ἐμπλέγματα γυναικεῖα. So the Etym. Mag. explains ἐμπλέκτρια by κομμήτρια, *qui crines intorquet*. And τὰ ἐμπλέγματα are instruments for binding the hair, like the χρυσαὶ τεττίγες of the antient Athenians. Hence may be understood an obscure passage of Artemid. 5, 53., ἔδοξε τις γυνὴ τὴν ἐμπλέκουσαν ἀντὶ θερὰ πιναν κ. τ. λ., i. e. τὴν ἐμπλεκτρίαν.

rings, and brooches, made of pearls, or other precious stones ; for I entirely agree with Schleusi, that *μαργαρίτης* sometimes “*latius patere, et omnino lapides pretiosos significare.*” I will only observe that as *χρυσός* and *μαργαρίται* are here used for the ornaments made of those materials, so the Latins use *aurum* and *gemma* ; as Virg. *Æn.* 4, 138. *Crines nodantur in aurum.* And Ovid *Heroic.* *Epist.* 21, 89. *Ipsa dedit gemmas digitis, et omnibus aurum.*

The Apostles, therefore, *both* mean to admonish Christian women to pay far *less* attention to external adorning than to internal, and to make virtue their *especial* ornament. A very similar passage, which will much illustrate these of the Apostles, occurs in Philostr. *Heroic.* c. 13., *ἐκομῆ τε ἀνεπαχθῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἤσκει τὴν κόμην, οὐδὲ ὑπέκειτο αὐτῇ, ἀλλὰ μόνην τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐποιεῖτο κόσμημα*, where the sentence *οὐ γὰρ ἤσκει τὴν κόμην*, is qualified and explained by the following *οὐδὲ ὑπέκειτο αὐτῇ*. See also Melissa ad *Clearetam*, p. 749., cited by Wets.

Upon the whole, it seems clear that the direction in question is intended chiefly to apply to their dress at the religious assemblies ; though it may be extended, *mutatis mutandis*, to their apparel at other times.

10. *ἐπαγγελομέναις θεοσέβειαν*. The verb *ἐπαγγέλεσθαι*, like the Latin *profiteri*, is used with various substantives in the accusative signifying the names of sciences and arts, and sometimes those of mental habits, and virtues, as here. Of all these examples may be seen in Wets. *Θεοσεβεία*, properly signifies a *worship of God*, and was applied by the Israelites to the religious observances of a faithful devotee ; but it was borrowed, like many other words, and transferred to the Christian religion, with a change of signification, so as to denote what we call *godliness*.

11, 12. *γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μαθησέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ*. The best Commentators are agreed that this relates to the same subject, namely, public worship ; q. d. “Not only let the *men* alone pray, and the women be clothed with modesty of every kind, but let the women refrain from *teaching* : let the woman learn,” &c. This is mentioned, lest it might have been supposed that they were allowed to *instruct*, if not to *pray*. Theophyl. well explains thus : *Οὐ μόνον μέχρι σχημάτων καὶ καταστολῆς κοσμία ἔστω ἡ γυνή, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέχρι φωνῆς· μὴ φηγγέσθω γὰρ, φησι, μηδὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν, ἀλλὰ μαθησέτω μόνον. Τοῦτο δὲ αὐτῇ ἔσται μᾶλλον, ἐὰν ἡσυχάσῃ.*

11. ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, “in quiet silence.” The words following ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ are exegetical of the preceding, and signify “with all obedience and submission.” Though the μαρτανέτω might well indicate the Apostle’s meaning, yet, to make it the more decided, he adds γυναῖκί δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρὸς. The verb αὐθεντεῖν properly signifies “to slay with one’s own hand;” then, to *do any thing* (as we familiarly say) of one’s own head (Moeris, αὐτοδικὸς), or taking law into *one’s own head*. Hence it comes to mean *act the master, exercise authority over*: and thus it is here explained by the antients ἐξουσιάζειν. As verbs of ruling take the Genitive, so here we have ἀνδρὸς, by which is meant, not *husband*, but, in a general sense, *man*. Indeed ἀνδρὸς and γυναῖκί may be said to stand for the *male and female sex*.

At εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, Heinr. subauds κελεύω. But βούλομαι, which has been used more than once, and has nearly the same sense, is preferable. Rosenm. explains the ἡσυχία by *otio*, i. e. a not discharging any public office. But it seems rather to signify *silence*, with the adjunct notion of obedience and acquiescence.

The Philological Commentators here overwhelm us with passages expressive of the duty of the female sex to observe *silence and obedience to the male* ! But all this learning might have been spared; since it is (I think) clear that the Apostle’s words only apply to silence and obedience to the other sex *in the exercise of public worship*: though I grant that political and domestic subjection seems *implied* in the argument for religious subordination. And, indeed, considering the doctrine of the Old Testament and the Jewish Law, St. Paul could consider the matter in no other light.

13, 14. In adducing these reasons why the woman should be in subjection to the man, we are to consider St. Paul as a Jew urging such arguments as Jews urged, and such as were understood and allowed by Jews, and were regarded as popular arguments in

general, especially to those who, like the Gentile Christians, acknowledged the authority of the Old Testament. Compare a very similar passage of 1 Cor. 11, 8 & 9., where see the note. That the Jews were accustomed thus to argue is clear from the numerous Rabbinical passages adduced by Wets. and Loesner. They regarded even those *elements* which were first created as of greater dignity.

The ἐπλάσθη is used for ἐκτίσθη; with a reference to Gen. 2, 7. καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

14. Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη. The antient Commentators, and most judicious moderns, rightly repeat *πρῶτος* from the former verse. But it is *also* implied that Adam was not deceived by the serpent, but by the woman. Such is (I conceive) the true view of the sense, which is obscured rather than illustrated by many modern Commentators. See Pole and Wolf.

Of the next words ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἀπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε no satisfactory account is given by the Commentators. But it should seem that we have only again to take ἀπατηθεῖσα for πρώτη ἀπατ., and take ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε as meant κατ' ἐξοχήν, i. e. "But the woman being (first) deceived, was especially in fault (for the phrase ἐν παραβάσει γίνεσθαι is similar to *in culpā esse*, and savours of Latinism)." So Theophyl. observes: πρὸς τὴν σύγκρισιν οὖν τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτὸν φησι μὴ ἀπατηῆσθαι. For, (he adds) Eve was brought over by *desire*; Adam, by the *persuasions of his wife*. And he sums up the general argument of the Apostle thus: φησιν οὖν, ὅτι ἀπαξ ἐδίδαξεν ἡ γυνή, καὶ πάντας κατέστρεψε· διὰ τοῦτο μὴ διδασκέτω τὸ γένος· κούφον γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ εὐπαράδεκτον, καὶ εὐπαράγωγον. The argument is built upon the original and thence derived comparative imbecility and persuasibility of the female sex, and consequent unfitness for public instruction.

15. σωθήσεται δὲ—σωφροσύνης.

There are few passages that have more exercised the Commentators than the present. All the various interpretations it were use-

less for me to detail and review. I shall therefore notice the principal ones.

The antient and many eminent modern Commentators, as Crell., Le Clerc, and especially the recent ones, interpret the *τεκνογονίας* of education. But this is quite unsupported by authority, or even analogy; and yields too limited a sense. Rosenm. (from the Syr. and Crell.) takes the *διὰ* for *σύν*, and *τεκνογονίας* for the *offspring, the children themselves*: which, he thinks, is confirmed by *μεινῶσιν*. But that admits of a more natural interpretation in another way; and this use of *διὰ* in so uncommon a sense with *τεκν.* is unprecedented, and too little analogical to permit any confidence in this interpretation, which, indeed, yields a very frigid sense. I should prefer that of Knatchbull, Hammond, Kidder, Doddr., Wells, Harris, and Mackn., who understand *τῆς τεκν.* of the *bringing forth of the promised Messiah*: which they think countenanced by the article, and agreeable to the context. Yet it involves too much harshness; and those are precarious grounds on which to rest such a sense; nor (as Benson observes) is there any where else in Scripture any allusion to such a promise. The least objectionable interpretation seems to be that of many eminent moderns, as Whitby, Locke, Benson, and others, who take the *διὰ* in the sense *through*, and regard this as a general intimation that pious women might cheerfully commit themselves to God in the hour of nature's distress, if they trusted in God, maintaining charity withal, persevering in chastity, and strictly adhering to the laws of temperance in every other respect. But this lies open to the objection that the deliverance is not confined to Christian, or even virtuous women: and though the answer of Whitby seems plausible, it is not satisfactory. I would observe that the nature of the context evidently requires *σωθήσεται* to be taken, not in the sense of *temporal deliverance*, but of *salvation* in the theological sense. Then it has not been sufficiently attended to that at *σωθ.* we are to repeat *γυνή*, and take it of the *whole sex*; by which we meet the objection that many die virgins, and others do not bear children. Finally, the sense of the passage, which is expressed populariter, and therefore must not be too much pressed upon, seems to be as follows: "The sex, however, which was the means of bringing such ruin on the human race, will not suffer the punishment of this, but will only undergo that temporal penalty which was denounced in the curse on the first parent: it will, I say, be *saved*, as a *sex*, and all the *individuals* of it, if they embrace and continue in the Christian faith, and especially practise those duties of loving obedience, holiness, and modesty, which it enjoins." This view of the passage is (I find) nearly the same with that which appears to have been taken by Calvin; and it seems to be liable to no serious objection: for the *enallage* is too common to create any difficulty.

CHAP. III.

Hitherto the Apostle has been speaking of public prayer in sacred assemblies. Now a new subject is introduced, on the virtues required in him who should preside as supreme teacher over these assemblies (ver. 1—7. Compare 1 Pet. 5, 1. seqq.) ; which leads the Apostle to notice those desired in a conscientious administrator of the public property. (ver. 8—13.) (Heinr.)

VERSE 1. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. On these words the Commentators are at issue. The antients and some moderns (as Pisc., Mag., Wells, and Slade) refer them to the *preceding*. Others, as the most eminent moderns, to the *following*, and (I think) with most reason : for though Mr. Slade urges that the same phrase is referred to what goes before at c. 4, 9., yet it there rather refers to the whole of the context ; and this formula is unquestionably referred to the following, supra 1, 15. And as to his objection, that the words scarcely suit the subject, and the Chapter did not require to be thus solemnly introduced ; I answer that it is not necessary to *press on* the sense of πιστὸς, which is well rendered in our Common Version, *true*. And so 1, 15. 2 Tim. 2, 11. Tit. 1, 9. πιστοῦ λόγου. Apoc. 21, 5. ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί. & 22, 6.

Before εἴ τις must be supplied ὅτι, which is omitted, to impart vigour to the sentence by the *asyndeton*.

1. ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται. Here there is an idiom common in the Classical writers. Thus Diodor. Sic. L. 14. (cited by Munthe) ἡγεμονίας ὀρέγεσθαι. Ἐπισκοπῆς, *office of a Bishop*. Καλοῦ ἔργου. The addition of the word ἔργου shows that the Apostle adverts to the *duty itself*, and not to the *honour* or *emolument* ; and I cannot but think that he meant thus to hint that the *former*, not the latter, was to be

coveted.* Ἔργον is always used of a laborious and weighty office. So Isocrat. Dem. (cited by Wets.) τοὺς δόξης ὀρεγομένους—ὅσοι μὲν οὖν πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτῶν φίλους τοὺς προτρεπτικούς λόγους συγγράφουσι, καλὸν ἔργον ἐπιχειροῦσι.

Rosenm. briefly remarks on the term ἐπίσκοπος: "h. l. est doctor et antistes." But the matter is not to be dismissed in so hasty and summary a manner. See on Philip. 1, 1. Theodoret annotates thus: 'Ἐπίσκοπον δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν πρεσβύτερον λέγει, ὡς τὴν πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστολὴν ἐρμηνεύοντες ἀπεδείξαμεν' ῥάδιον δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐντεῦθεν καταμαθεῖν' μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς ἐπισκοπικούς νόμους τοὺς τοῖς διακόνοις προσήκοντας γράφει, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους παριλιπὼν· ἄλλ' ὅπερ ἔφην, τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν πότε πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκόπους· τοὺς δὲ νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους, ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον· τοῦ δὲ χρόνου πορίοντος, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὄνομα τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἀποστόλοις κατέλιπον· τὴν δὲ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν· οὕτω Φιλιππησίων ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἦν· ὑμῶν γάρ, φησὶν, ἀπόστολον, καὶ συνεργὸν τῆς χρείας μου· οὕτω Κρητῶν ὁ Τίτος, καὶ Ἀσιανῶν ὁ Τιμόθεος ἀπόστολοι· οὕτω ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τοῖς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι· ἄλλ' ὅμως εἰ καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἐνομοτέθησε Παῦλος, εὐδηλον ὡς τοὺς ἐπισκοποὺς πρῶτους προσήκει τοὺς φυλάττειν τοὺς νόμους, ἅτε διὰ καὶ μείζονος μεταλαχόντας τιμῆς.

On the term in question see Schleus., who observes, from Suidas, that among the Athenians the name ἐπισκόποι was given to οἱ εἰς τὰς ὑπὲρκόους πόλεις ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ παρ' ἐκάστοις πεμπόμενοι. He might have cited Appian, 1, 708, 39. Φιλοποίμενα—ἐπίσκοπον Ἐφεσίων.

2. Now follow the *qualifications* which in the election of Bishops were especially to be regarded.

2. ἀνεπίληπτος is properly an agonistical term, signifying one who gives his adversary no *hold* upon him; but it is often (as here) applied metaphorically to him who gives others no handle to justly accuse him. Whether there be any mystical allusion (as Grot. and others say) to the requisition under the law, that the priests were to be without bodily infirmities (see Lev. 21, 16.) seems doubtful.

2. μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα.

The meaning of these words has been very warmly debated. My limits will not permit me to detail at large the various opinions:

* So Theodoret: οὐχ ἀπλῶς τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλαρχίας κατηγορεῖ· καὶ διδάσκει μὴ τιμῆς, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ὀρέγεσθαι μὴ τὴν ἀξίαν ποθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀξίας τὸ ἔργον ἐπιζητεῖν.

and therefore I must refer the reader to Pole, Benson, and Mackn. That the Apostle forbids polygamy, is plain : and the only question is whether he means *successive*, or *simultaneous* polygamy. The former position is maintained by almost all the Roman Catholic, and many Protestant Commentators. They are, however, not agreed on the exact *kind*. Some take it of the polygamy of having more than two females, who, though not in the *possession* of conjugal rights, have, at least by unjust divorce, a *claim* to them. So Hamm. &c. Others, as almost all the Catholic Commentators, and also Grot. and Wets., understand this as forbidding second marriages, after the death of the other party. The maintainers of this opinion are properly called *Monogamists*. The latter position, namely, that it applies to *simultaneous polygamy*, is supported by the most eminent Protestant Commentators, especially Benson : and such are called *Deuterogamists*. The question (which is indeed a perplexing one) seems to be almost wholly at issue between the two classes, the Monogamists and the Deuterogamists *properly so called*. And I must confess that great erudition, and what appears *great authority*, is ranged on the former side. On the latter, though far less learning, yet, I apprehend, greater show of *reason* is found. Indeed as to the former class, the authority is less powerful than it seems to be ; since such works as the *Constit. Apostolici*, *Constit. Clem.* and others, are generally admitted not to be of the high antiquity claimed for them by some ; or, at all events, they are interpolated. And though *Tertullian*, a very antient Father, was a Monogamist, yet his opinions on many other points are so eccentric as to greatly weaken his authority on any. And as to *Clemens, Alex.*, and others, they were of a much later period ; and there is reason to think that the dogmas in support of celibacy and monkery had very early started up in the Church. Besides, to their's we may oppose the opinion of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Jerome, passages from whom are cited by Benson. To which it may be added, that the annotation of Theodoret (who almost always compiles from the best authorities) is in favour of *deuterogamy* ; i. e. he takes the passage as forbidding *polygamy*. His observations are so admirable that, though somewhat long, I cannot but detail them. Πάλαι γὰρ εἰώθεισαν καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ δύο καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσι γυναιξὶ νόμῳ γάμου κατὰ ταῦτον συνοικεῖν· τινες δὲ καὶ νῦν, καίτοι τῶν βασιλικῶν νόμων δύο κατὰ ταῦτον ἄγεσθαι κωλύοντων γυναῖκας, καὶ παλλακῖσι μίγνυνται, καὶ ἐταίραις· ἔφασαν τοίνυν τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον εἰρηκέναι, τὸν μὲν μόνῃ γυναικὶ συνοικοῦντα σωφρονῶς, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἄξιον εἶναι χειροτονίας· οὐ γὰρ τὸν δεύτερον, φασίν, ἐξέβαλε γάμον, ὅγε πολλὰκις τοῦτο γενέσθαι κελεύσας· γυνὴ γὰρ, φησὶ, δέδετα νόμῳ ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ἔῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ· καὶ πάλιν· λέγω δὲ ταῖς ἀγάμοις, καὶ ταῖς χήραις· καὶ συνάψας ἐκάτερον τάγμα, εἷα τίθεικε νόμον· τῷ ὄντι γὰρ περκευμένης τῆς ἐγκρατείας οὐ τῆς γνώμης ἡ διγαμία· εἰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς τὴν προτέραν ἐκβαλὼν ἐτέρα συνεζύγη, μέμψεως ἄξιος καὶ κατηγορίας ὑπεύθυνος· εἰ δὲ τὸ βίαιον τοῦ θανάτου διέξενε τὴν προτέραν, ἡ δὲ φύσις ἐπικειμένη

δευτέρα ζευχθῆναι κατηνάγκασε γυναικί, οὐκ ἐκ γνώμης, ἀλλ' ἐκ περιστάσεως ὁ δεύτερος γεγένηται γάμος. And Theophyl. seems to have been of the same opinion. Nay, even Chrys. himself, though he says very little, appears to have been a Deuterogamist. The purpose of the Apostle, he says, was τὴν ἀμετρίαν κωλύειν. But how can it justly be thought an ἀμετρία to marry a second wife after the death of the first, especially in an age so corrupt as the apostolic? Besides, as Benson justly observes, the Apostle at Hebr. 13, 4., speaks of marriage as honourable for *all*; and in this Epistle he speaks with severity of those who *forbid to marry*. (See more in Benson.) Moreover, as we have seen that the authorities of the Monogamists are not very formidable, so, I think, it will appear that their *arguments* are as little so. I may, however, be excused detailing them; and the reader is referred to Whitby, Benson, Doddridge, Macknight, Rosenmuller, and Heinr. Jaspis decides the matter thus: “Qui secundas celebrabat nuptias, nimia intemperantia et incontinentia accusabatur, fides, prior uxori data, neglecta videbatur, novercam in familiam inducere eique liberos prioris conjugis tradere, periculosum ducebatur. Huic opinioni cautè se accommodat Paulus, ut 5, 9. Efr. Tit. 1, 6. Neque vero ideo scripsit commune præceptum seu legem omni tempore observandam. Regula modo est prudentia, ut 5 c. 1 Cor. 7. 15.” I am inclined to acquiesce in the opinion that the Apostle intended to repress all intemperance by forbidding polygamy both *simultaneous* and *successive* (i. e. by causeless divorce *). But, after all, the point in question is so little capable of positive *determination*, that perhaps the most prudent verdict of a critical jury would be in this, as in many other cases, “*Non liquet*.” At all events, we see how little the Romanists have to plead in defence of the celibacy of the clergy.

2. νηφάλεον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, *vigilant*, † *sober, orderly*. (See Theophyl.) These epithets seem to form a character. That such should be the qualifications of Christian Bishops, is no wonder; since we find from the Classical writers that many of them were required even in the *Heathen Priests*. So Æschyl. Theb. 606. Οὗτος δ' ὁ μάντις σώφρων, δί-

* It is strange that any, as Cameron, should have supposed the Apostle meant only to enjoin *conjugal fidelity to a wife*. For surely none could need to be told that an *adulterer* was no fit person to be Bishop.

† This is suggested by the very term ἐπίσκοπος, which implies *vigilant superintendence*. In this view I would cite an interesting passage adduced from an antient Poet in the Schol. on Eurip. Phœn. 1123. Καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοπον. Ἀργὸν ἱεὶ κρατερόν τε μέγαν τε, Τέτροσιν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρώμενον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα Ἀκάματον δὲ οἱ ᾤρσε θεὰ μένος, οὐδὲ οἱ ὕπνος Πίπτειν ἐπὶ βλεφάρουσιν, φυλακὴ δ' ἔχεν ἔμπεδον αὐτόν.

καιος, ἀγαθός, εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ, μέγας προφήτης. Thus the terms here used are sometimes found in the Classical writers; especially the two last. Wets. adduces several examples, to which I add Herodian 1, 2, 3. & 1, 8, 5. Κόσμιος signifies *decorous, orderly*. So Theophyl. explains it σεμνοπρεπῆ. In the same sense σέμνος is used, Tit. 2, 2. and Phil. 4, 8.

Φιλόξενον, *hospitable*. A quality, it may be observed, especially necessary for those times, in which, as there were no inns, it was the more a duty to relieve the wants of strangers, travellers, &c. See Rom. 12, 13. In the parallel passage of Titus there is added φηλόγαθον.

Διδακτικόν. It is strange that Schleus. should render this *docibilis*, i. e. one who is docile, will not obstinately have his own way. It rather denotes one possessing the knowledge to teach and the faculty of communicating it, so as to be an useful instructor. So Tit. 1, 7. ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου, ἵνα δυνατὸς ᾖ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν.

3. μὴ πάροινον. The antient, and some modern Commentators, as Erasm. and Pric., and most recent ones, explain this ὑβριστήν. And the word sometimes has that sense, since it not only denotes the use of wine, παρὰ τὸ δέον, but the brutal spirit which it engenders. Yet one can scarcely see why the Apostle should mention *that*; since it is not likely that any one stained with such a vice would be elected. See the note *infr.* ver. 8. He rather seems, by the μὴ πάροινον—αἰσχροκερδῆ, to advert to certain habits which, not being decidedly vicious, might, in the opinion of some, not quite unfit a man for the office in question, and which, considering the prevalence of drunkenness, he would be likely to contract. The term, therefore, seems to be synonymous with the μὴ οἶνω πολλῶ προσέχοντας said of the Deacons at ver. 8., and may be rendered: “not given to much wine.”

Πλήκτην. This is usually taken in the physical sense, *no striker*, non manu promptus, as says Gell. 20, 1. But it is objected, that it is no great matter for a Bishop to abstain from *this*. Both the antients and the most eminent moderns take it in a metaphorical sense, to denote *pugnacious, quarrelsome*; which seems confirmed by the antithetical ἄμαχον.* The antients explain it, one who indulges in bitter and severe invectives. Which may be *included*; since it is becoming in a Bishop to correct in the spirit of meekness; and, to use the words of Jaspis, sit potius ἐπεικῆς, ἐγχαρῶν, μέτριος, non summi juris semper tenax, sed pronus ad ferendam et condonandam injuriam.

3. μὴ αἰσχροκερδῇ. This is usually interpreted, “not guilty of filthy lucre, not sordidly covetous.” But this is liable to the same objection as certain interpretations of πάροινος and πλήκτης just adverted to. Nor are we confined to such a sense. The term αἰσχροκερδῆς is of extensive signification, and denotes not only a *lover of filthy lucre*, but “one who would gain money by any methods, if not dishonest, yet discreditable.” So Theophyl.: ὁ μηδὲν κέρδος παραιτούμενος, καὶ ὅθεν δήποτε ᾗ. And the best modern Commentators are agreed that this is the sense here. So Crell., Mackn., and Jaspis, which last Commentator observes: “Artem sellularium et opificium simul quidem tractare poterat, id quod tum necesse erat, sed sordidum interdicitur vitæ genus; vetatur item usuraria pravitas ac ludendi libido, et omnis turpis quæstus vel in honesto vitæ genere.” See the numerous Classical citations of Wets., few, however,

* The Commentators cite Plut. 1, 298., τῇ δὲ χειρὶ πλήκτης; and 403., ἀνὴρ πλήκτης. To which I would add Plut. Crass. 9., πλήκται καὶ ποδωκεῖς ἄνδρες, ἰ. ε. μαχίμοι. Thucyd. 3, 82, 8., τὸ δὲ ἐμπλήκτης ὄζυ. Fab. 11, 19., κατὰ χεῖρα πλήκτης ἀνὴρ. Dicæarch. p. 15., θρασεῖς δὲ καὶ ὑβριστὰι καὶ ὑπερήφανοι πλήκται τε κ. τ. λ. And Pollux 6, 129., reckons, among the disturbers of a state, τοὺς πλῆκτας.

of which are apposite.* It therefore signifies a discreditable, dirty, base, way of getting money; though it may also *include* the other sense, namely *avarice*, or over fondness for money, which is base in a Priest, of whatever denomination: for (as Doddr. observes) never does an eagerness or greediness in pursuit of money appear more dishonorable and sordid than in persons of that noble profession.

It is strange that so many Critics should have thought the word *αἰσχρο.* not genuine, and that it should have been cancelled by Griesb. It is only omitted in a comparatively few MSS. including most of those that have been *emended*; and the genuineness of the word is established by the *antithesis* (See Wolf and Wets.); therefore as to what is urged by those who cancel the word, that it was introduced *in order to complete* the *antithesis*, this is (as Wolf observes) too subtle a mode of reasoning.

Ἐπιεικῇ. Compare Eph. 4, 5. Ἀμαχον is opposed to the *πλήκτης*, and signifies ἀφιλόνηκον, one who is

* The most so is Aristot. Nich. 4, 3., ὁ μέντοι κυβευτής, καὶ ὁ λωποδύτης, καὶ ὁ ληστής τῶν ἀνελευθέρων εἰσιν, αἰσχροκερδεῖς; where, by the *λωπὸδ.* (I apprehend) is meant one of those desperados who, both in antient and modern times, accompany an army, in order to strip the dead: an occupation dangerous as well as disgraceful. By the ὁ ληστής is meant, not a *thief*, or *robber*, but a sort of marauders who followed an army for plunder, and also carried on a sort of *privateering*, and lived by rapine. This sense of the word often occurs in Thucyd., Xenophon., and other *antient* writers. To the above passages I would add Aristot. Rhet. p. 107., where he mentions τὸ κερδαίνειν ἀπὸ μικρῶν, ἢ ἀπὸ αἰσchrῶν κ. τ. λ. And then he adds that this arises ἀπὸ αἰσχροκερδείας καὶ ἀνελευθερίας. And in Eth., p. 139., he mentions τοὺς ἀνελευθεροὺς ἐργασίας ἐργαζόμενοι, to which he attributes αἰσχροκερδεΐα: subjoining, πάντες γὰρ ἕνεκα κέρδους καὶ τούτου μικροῦ ὀνειδῆ ὑπομένουσιν. See also two fine sketches in Theophr. Ch. Eth., περὶ ἀναισχυντίας (on *unblushing shabbiness and meanness*), and περὶ αἰσχροκερδείας, the former of which he defines a καταφρόνησις δόξης, αἰσchrῶν ἕνεκα κέρδους; and the latter, a περιουσία κέρδους αἰσchrῶ, which (though the Commentators do not notice it) signifies, a being overcome by base gain, so as to do any thing for the sake of it, i. e. κέρδους ἥττων, or ἡττώμενος, which terms often occur in the best Classical writers; as I shall show on Thucyd. 2, 60.

not over tenacious of his right. I would compare Herodot. 5, 53, 16., πολλοὶ τῶν δικαίων τὰ ἐπικέστέρα προτιθέασι.

The ἀφιλάργυρον answers to the μὴ αἰσχροκερδῇ*.

4. τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, "one who manages and regulates well his own family." Of the Classical passages cited by Wets., the most apposite is Diog. Laert. 1, 70., μαθάνειν τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας καλῶς προστατεῖν. To which I add Dionys. Hal. 1, 178., ἐμέμφετο δὲ τοὺς κακῶς προϊσταμένους τῶν ἰδιῶν. Tacit. Germ. suam quisque sedem, suos Penates regit. See also Eurip. Troad. 662., et seqq., Herodian 2, 173., and Philostr. Vit. Soph. 1, 2.

The words following are exegetical, and show that this regulation is to be effected by a dignified firmness in holding the reins of government: for I cannot, with some recent Commentators, refer the μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος to the *children*.

5. εἰ δὲ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου—ἐπιμελήσεται; The sentiment is plain, and appears to have been founded on a sort of proverb, which occurs in various authors, and of which the Philological Commentators have adduced many examples; namely, "that he who cannot take care of his private affairs, is not fit to be entrusted with the administration of public business;" every family being regarded as a little republic.

It is observed by Theophyl., in answer to those who thought the Apostle might have been expected to require *more* from the Bishops than these humble qualifications, nay, something of *angelic purity* (ἀγ-

* The effect produced by this admonition of the Apostle seems, from the records of early Ecclesiastical History, not to have been so great as might have been wished. My learned readers will remember some passages of Euseb. and other writers. But few may be aware of the following curious passage from an Epistle of Libanius to St. Basil (Ep. 1592., Ed. Wolf.), πᾶς μὲν ἐπίσκοπος πρᾶγμα δυσγρίπτορον, Angl. "a sadly griping, tenacious sort of body." In his answer, however, Basil well retorts the charge on *Sophists*, who traffic in words and speeches, as those who hawk about the μελίπηκτα (honey-cakes and gingerbread): whereas, asks he, τις τῶν ἐπισκόπων τοὺς λόγους ἐφοροθέτησεν; τις τοὺς μαθητευομένους μισθοφόρους κατέστησεν; This was indeed giving him a Rowland for his Oliver!

γελικὸν βίον καὶ ἀπαθή), that these ἐπίσκοποι being then appointed over every city or large town, and many being wanted, it was prudent in the Apostle to require σύμμετρον ἀρετὴν ἢν πολλοῖς ἐνὴν εὐρεῖν.*

6. μὴ νεόφυτον, “not a new convert, yet, as it were, in his noviciate; by a metaphor like 1 Cor. 3, 6. ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα. See also Is. 5, 7. and Job. 14, 9. Thus the term is explained by the antients νεοβάπτιστος, νεοκοπήχης, προσήλυτος. Heinr. takes it to mean *adolescentem*, a raw youth, little acquainted with life. And he cites Tacit. Ann. 4, 17. ne quis mobiles adolescentium animos præmaturis honoribus ad superbiam extolleret. But this does not so well suit the words following. Besides, Timothy himself was a very young man, else the Apostle would have had no reason to say Μηδεὶς σοῦ τὴν νεότητα καταφρονεῖται.

6. ἵνα μὴ τυφωθείς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου. The τυφωθείς signifies *puffed up with pride*. So Theophyl.: φυσιοῦμενος; and Theodoret: τῆς ἀλαζονείας τὸ πάθος δεξιόμενος. This is supposed to proceed from that comparative ignorance which may be expected in a new convert; and the term is elsewhere used

* But perhaps the best answer is, that such objections confound the Bishop and the individual, the former of which alone the Apostle has here in view; so that it would have been irrelevant to say: a Bishop shall be one who crucifies the flesh, that takes up his cross daily, &c. These are the qualifications of the man, and not the Bishop, and are supposed, but cannot be ascertained. Besides, I cannot admit that the standard is fixed too low. For if a Bishop be νηφάλιος, σωφρὼν, κόσμιος, φιλόξενος, διδακτικὸς, ἐπιεικὴς, ἄμαχος, ἀφιλάργυρος, τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενος, μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχων ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, I can hardly see what more could be desired! And if it be said that the Apostle might have added, “He shall be ready (as his Divine Master says) to lay down his life for the sheep,” I answer, that could not well be considered as a qualification to be contemplated by electors, since not the individual himself could tell that, but the Searcher of all hearts. Besides, to have mentioned that would have been discouraging any from undertaking the office. And let it be remembered, that many Bishops did lay down their lives for the sheep, and have continued so to do in after times; and even we Protestants can boast of some Bishops who are justly reckoned as not the least illustrious in the noble army of martyrs and confessors of the faith.

with words expressive of ignorance. So *infra* 6, 9. *τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος* : and Polyb. 2, 81. *ἀγνοεῖ καὶ τετύφωται*, cited by Schleus. in *voc.* to whose examples I add Aristid. 2, 67 c. *τι δεῖ τετυφωμένως οὕτω φιλονεικεῖν*. Liban. 216 c. *ἐμπλήκτους καὶ τετυφωμένους*, and Marc. Anton. 12, 27. f. *ὕπὸ ἀτυφίας* (I conjecture *ἀτυφίας*) *τύφος τυφόμενος πάντων χαλεπώτατος*. And not only does ignorance generate pride, but novelty, especially in the young, engenders what Thucyd. calls the *τὸ ἐμπλήκτως ὄξυ* generally found in new converts, but inconsistent with the *ἐπιεικεία*, *σωφροσύνη*, and *κοσμιότης* before mentioned. The words *ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου* are explained by Luther and Erasm., and also by most recent Commentators, of falling under the censure of the calumniator. But this sense of *διάβολος* is so little supported by the authority of the New Testament, and so little agreeable to the context, that I cannot but reject it. The common interpretation, by which the *διάβ.* is taken of the Arch enemy, the author of all evil, who, as we learn from Scripture, thus, “fell from his high estate” by pride, is so natural that nothing more can be desired. Theophyl. well explains thus : *εἰς τὸ κατάκριμα, καὶ εἰς τὴν κατάδικην τοῦ διαβόλου πεσεῖται, ἢν τινα ἐκεῖνος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπονοίας ὑπέστη*, “fall under the same condemnation and punishment which he did.” And so Œcumen.

7. *δεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν*. Tangi hac admonitione ipse Timotheus, utpote juvenis, videbatur : inde in ejus solatium addit : *δεῖ καλ. μαρτ. ἔχειν*, quo Timotheus gaudebat, Actor. 16, 2. (Hein.) The *μαρτυρ. καλ.* must (Theophyl. says,) regard his *life*, and not his *doctrine*. For the *morals* of any Christian teacher they will scarcely ever censure causelessly. Thus they did not call the Apostles fornicators, or lewed persons, but impostors. “If (adds he) any one should be of bad repute, though causelessly, let him not be appointed a Bishop.” The *μαρτυρία* may be rendered *character*. By the *τῶν ἑξωθεν* are meant non-christians,

whether Jews or Gentiles (as 1 Thess. 4, 2. and Col. 4, 5.), called at Eph. 2, 13. οἱ μακρὰν, as Christians οἱ ἔγγυς.

The sense of the words following ἵνα μὴ—Διαβόλου is somewhat obscure, and has been differently explained by both antients and moderns. Theophyl., Œcumen., and many others offer the most contort expositions; and that of Heinr., “notat culpam aliorum et malitiosam insectationem,” is too far fetched to deserve attention. Benson and Rosenm. explain it of falling into the censure and snares laid by the adversary or accuser. But this is frigid; and had such been the sense intended, the article would not have been used. Nor can I recognise, with some, an hendiadis. The best way of removing the difficulty is by supposing, with Theodoret, Grot., and Doddr., that the words μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν chiefly regard his character *before his conversion*. So Theodoret: ὁ γὰρ παρ’ ἐκείνοις πλείστην ἔχων πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας διαβολὴν, ἐπονείδιστος τὸ κοινόν, καὶ εἰς τὴν προτέραν ὅτι τάχιστα παλινδρομήσει παρανομίαν, τοῦ διαβόλου πάντα πρὸς τοῦτο μηχανωμένου. Such (observes Grot.) as had been of bad repute might be received as Christians, but are here forbidden to be made Presbyters, the reason for which is subjoined.”

The force of the εἰς ὄνειδ. is clear; but not so with the καὶ (εἰς) παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου. It cannot (I think) mean, what many antient and modern Commentators suppose, a *temptation to anger* and revenge of their injustice; but rather (as Theophyl. and Doddr. interpret,) a temptation (strangely besetting to human nature) *not be scandalized for nothing*. See Doddr. It is truly remarked by Theophyl., that if it is necessary he should have a good testimony (or character) with those *without*, still more ought he to have it with *those within*. Thoughts (to use the words of Doddr.) worthy the consideration of all candidates for the ministry who have been profligate in their lives, and of those who, after having been so, wish to return to it. (See also Mackn.) Worthy, too (I

would add), is it the consideration of those who venture to incur the awful responsibility of placing them in situations where they can neither have a καλήν μαρτυρίαν from those within, nor those without, and where a confidence once broken can scarcely be renewed.

8. The qualifications mentioned in regard to *Deacons* are nearly the same with those of *Bishops*, only not so many. They are (for instance) not called upon to be νηφάλιοι or διδακτικοί. The φιλόξενον (I conjecture) is not mentioned, because they seem to have had no *stipend*; and the ἐπιεικής and ἄμαχος are not touched upon, because they had little or no *authority* properly so called. The ὡσαύτως (as Chrys. observes) regards what follows.

8. Μὴ διλόγους. This is explained by most Commentators *mendaces*. And they cite from Virg., Tyriosque *bilingues*: and compare the διψύχος of James 4, 8. But it is best explained by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) μὴ ὑπόλους καὶ δολεροῦς, ἀλλὰ φρονούντας καὶ ἄλλα λέγοντας, καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις, καὶ ἄλλα ἐκείνοις. The terms δίλογος and διλογεῖν are indeed used by good authors, but more frequently δίγλωσσος; and it is possible that St. Paul might have in mind this passage of Sirach 28, 14. ψιθυρὸν καὶ δίγλωσσον.* *Why* the Apostle should have required this the Commentators do not offer any satisfactory reason. For as to διλογία, in commercial transactions (which Heinr. supposes) it can hardly be imagined. The Apostle, I should conjecture, has rather regard to that candid, frank, and ingenuous spirit which in persons who (like the Deacons) *went*, as it were, *between* the Bishop and the people, would be highly necessary, especially as difference of opinion respecting Jewish rites and ceremonies existed among the congregation.

8. μὴ οἶνω πολλῶ προσέχοντας, “not given to much

* I would also compare Solon ap. D. Laert. 1, 61. Γλῶσσα δὲ οἱ διχόμυθος ἐκ μελαίνης φρενὸς γεγωνή. See also Eurip. *Troas* 288. Matth.

wine. Theophyl. observes, that the Apostle does not say *μὴ μεθύσους*; for *that* were altogether unworthy; but not great drinkers; for even if it produce not inebriation, much wine weakens the tone of the mind.* Nay even the Heathen priests, on having to enter a temple, did not drink wine. *Προσέχειν*, in the sense *to be habituated to, prone to*, is frequent. See the Philological Commentators.

8. *οὐκ αἰσχροκερδεῖς*. The term must be taken with the same latitude as at ver. 3. and yet *freedom from avarice* is chiefly intended; since great was the temptation that attended the office in question. And I entirely agree with Heinr., that in a populous trading place like Ephesus this admonition was the more necessary.

9. *ἔχοντας*—*συνειδήσει*. Most modern Commentators take *ἔχ.* for *κατεχ.*, “holding fast the true doctrine;” in opposition to the Judaizers. But it may be sufficient, with the antients, to interpret it, *professing, maintaining*. Rosenm. renders: “retinentes Christianam doctrinam et puram conscientiam.” I propose, with Pisc. and Erasmus, to take *ἐν* for *σύν*, *with*. So Theophyl.: *μετὰ τοῦ τὸ δόγμα ὁρθὸν τηρεῖν, ἔχοντας καὶ βίον ἀνεπίληπτον*. Grot. takes it in the sense *by* (like the Hebr. *ב*); since those who neglect faith lose a good conscience. See 1, 19. and also 1, 5. On *μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως* for “the truths of the Gospel,” see Eph. 1, 9. and 6, 19. Col. 4, 3. and the notes.

10. *καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν—ὄντες*, “And let these, too, be examined and put to the proof; and then let them, if found irreproachable, exercise the office.” *Δὲ, too*, i. e. as well as the Bishops: for the best Commentators are agreed that it must be extended to *them* (see Grot. and Whitby); and indeed in the case of election of Bishops examination pre-

* In which view I would compare Philostr. V. Ap. 1, 8. *καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἐναντιοῦσθαι τοῦ τῇ τοῦ νοῦ συστάσει, διαθολοῦντα τὸν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αἰθέρα*, and Horat. : *affigit humo divinæ particulam auræ*.

ceded election. On the nature of this δοκιμασία the Commentators are not agreed. The antients and some moderns understand by it, in both cases, trying the candidates some time before as private Christians. The most eminent moderns think it respects the examination into their character and conduct previous to the election; which seems the best founded interpretation, and includes the other. Both are equally supported by the *usus loquendi*. This antient custom Grot. has learnedly illustrated both from Ecclesiastical History, and from the custom of the Rabbins, nay, also of the Greeks.

The ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες answers to the καλὴν μαρτυρίαν ἔχοντες at ver. 7. *Who* are to exercise the δοκιμασία we are not told. The congregation perhaps participated in the proceedings: but the *appointment*, no doubt, rested solely with the Bishop and Presbyters. See Bingham's Eccl. Antiq.

11. γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς. On what we are to understand by the γυναῖκες Commentators are not agreed. Most modern ones think the wives of the Deacons are meant. But to this it is, with reason, objected, that if so, it is strange nothing should have been said of the duties of *Bishop's* wives, which were of yet greater consequence. I therefore agree with the antients and, of the moderns, Menoch., Grot., Benson, Hardy, Mackn., Valpy, &c., that we are here to understand *Deaconesses*; an order mentioned at Rom. 16, 1. and (as Theoph. observes) very useful and necessary to the Church. "If (adds he) these were not meant, why should any mention have been introduced of women amongst what was said of Deacons?" Besides, I would add, the very epithets σεμνάς, νηφαλίους, μὴ διαβόλους, and πιστοὺς (two of which are applied to the Bishops (seem far more suitable to the *Deaconesses* than *Deacon's* wives. Assuredly the *usus loquendi* permits the word to be taken as well of *women* (i. e. *Deaconesses*) as *wives*. And the argument, that "thus the Apostle would

have expressed his meaning more clearly," is in a writer like St. Paul of little weight. Others object, that these are mentioned at ch. 5. But they are there only *alluded* to. And surely in a question like this the united voice of early antiquity, founded on tradition, or antient written information unknown to us, carries with it authority which it were unwise to reject. At the same time it is probable that the Deaconesses *were* sometimes Deacon's *wives*.

On ver. 12. see *supra* ver. 2 & 4.

13. οἱ γὰρ καλῶς διακονήσαντες—Ἰησοῦ. For those who have well discharged the office of Deacons, gain (thereby) an honorable step to further promotion, namely, to the office of Presbyter, or Bishop. Theophyl. explains βαθμὸν by προκοπήν. And so almost all Commentators, antient and modern. This interpretation is supported by a passage of Clem. Const., cited by Grot., and also Const. Apost. 8, 18, 22., cited by Benson, and Lightf. in loc. Hence, Grot. observes, it appears that some duties in the ministry of the word were committed to the Deacons, and that they were not confined to the office of serving tables. Theodoret, however, and Heinr., understand the βαθμ. of advancement and furtherance in the attainment of salvation. But that seems harsh.

The words καὶ πολλήν—Ἰησοῦ are exegetical of the preceding. But the whole is worded delicately, and therefore obscurely.

14, 15. The sense is uncertain from brevity. Ἐλπίζων must be resolved into καίπερ ἐλπίζω; and at εἰ δὲ βραδύνω there is an ellipsis for γράφω δὲ ὅτι εἰ βραδύνω ἵνα εἰδῇς. And this is supported by the authority of Theophyl., who renders: "These things I write, not as if I should never come again, but that, in case I tarry long, thou," &c.

Ἀναστρέφεισθαι, *conduct oneself*." The expression οἶκω Θεοῦ must be closely united with ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία; being exegetical of the former metaphor,

by which the Church is compared to the Temple of Jerusalem. See Eph. 2, 21. seqq. and the note. Ζῶντος, *living, true.*

15. στόλος καὶ ἐδραΐωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

There has been no little disputation among the modern Interpreters on the punctuation of this passage. Most of them connect the words with the preceding; as do also the antients. Nay, Œcumen. makes the division of the chapters here. Many, however, and most recent Commentators, connect them with the *following*. But the sense yielded by the antient punctuation is better; and it is surprising that any who have any knowledge or experience in Greek literature, could tolerate so harsh a construction as that which arises from the latter method, by which, too, the sentiment seems overloaded; whereas, if it be united with the preceding, it arises naturally out of the preceding metaphor, though it may be something of a catachresis by so sudden a change of its application. In such a case it were, (to say no more) a want of taste and judgment to seek refinements when the *sense* is clear. See Bp. Van Mildert's note ap. D'Oyley, who also observes that this application of the words best accords with the context, and is liable to no serious objections; for in no other way can the passage be so easily and consistently explained. I would add, that to any one who had experience in Greek construction, it must appear that καὶ before ὁμολ. has the inchoative force; for to take it as a mere copula would be harsh: and there is something very harsh and frigid in supposing καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα introduced after στόλος καὶ ἐδραΐωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. It flags and drops; whereas, in so spirited a writer as St. Paul, we may usually in such cases perceive a *climax*. I must therefore acquiesce in the common interpretation of these words.

As to referring the στόλος—ἀληθείας to *Timothy*; as did Chillingworth, J. H. Maius, and others ap. Wolf, and also Benson and Slade, that can on no account be admitted. The construction would be unprecedented; there would be a very harsh hyperbaton; and a συ would have been required before εἰδῆς, and ὧν after στόλος. And though (as Mr. Slade observes) James, Peter, and John are, at Gal. 2, 19., called *pillars*; yet *there* nothing more is added; nor are they called ἐδραΐωματα τῆς ἀληθείας; which would (I think) be incongruous. Besides, admitting that both words are applicable to such illustrious *Apostles*, I should be slow in believing that St. Paul would apply such magnificent terms to *Timothy*, only a young minister, much less an Apostle. And there is something very harsh in the sense that thus arises, namely, "This I have written to thee, who art a pillar and foundation of the truth, in order that thou mightst know how thou shouldst conduct thyself in the Church of God." Which involves a manifest incongruity. So that the words of Benson, that St. Paul has often had very loose and absurd interpreters; but he himself never wrote carelessly or absurdly—will turn against himself. Finally, as in the other nouns of the sentence (as οἶκῳ and ἐκκλησία) the article is left to be supplied,

so must it *here*. But, if so, the terms *cannot* be applicable to Timothy, nay, not even to Paul himself : and thus the words can only be applied to the preceding. As to Benson's subtleties, they will pass for nothing.

16. καὶ ὁμολογουμένως—μυστήριον. It is well observed by Heinr. ; “ Præfatiuncula indicetur gravitas et auctoritas ejus effati, quod jam esset proponendum, animique ea quam attentissimè excitentur, ut Cap. 1, 15. 3, 1. 2 Tim. 2, 19. Heb. 8. 1. “ Sequitur effatum ipsum sublimiore et ferè poeticâ dictione, quali uti solet Apostolus in doxologiis, prolatum.”

The connection, which has not been well discerned by the Commentators, seems to be this : “ And great is the dignity and importance of the Church universal, as being the depository of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, of which we may undoubtedly say : “ Great is the mystery of godliness ; and it is this that,” &c. Such (I must maintain) is the most *natural* interpretation of this passage ; though I readily admit its great difficulty, and can easily account for the various opinions which have been entertained by Commentators. As to the question respecting the *various readings* *ὅς* and *ὃ*, I cannot enter into the multiplicity of discussions connected with it. Suffice it to say that, after a careful examination of the evidence, it appears to me that *those readings* (which are, moreover, found in very few MSS.), seem to be *alterations* introduced in order to remove the difficulty occasioned by the extreme abruptness at *μυστήριον*, which, however, is quite consistent with the style of St. Paul. The *ὅς* is found especially in such MSS. as have been tampered with ; though so great seemed the difficulty of the common reading, that it is probable many Scribes adopted the emendation, or noted it in the margin. And this may account for the passage having been so seldom employed by the antient Fathers, in their arguments with the Pelagians and Arians ; namely, because they were unwilling to appeal to a text where the opponent might seek covert under a *diversity of reading*, or a *difficulty of construction*. As to the reading *ὅς ἐφανερώθη*, we may safely maintain that it is *not Greek*, at least, in the sense which the espousers of that reading lay down, namely : “ He who was manifested,” &c. : though I am not prepared to say, with Nolan, that we should then have had *φανερωθεῖς*. (See his remarks on this text, in his excellent treatise on the integrity of the Greek Vulg.) The only construction permitted by the propriety of language would be that of referring it to Θεοῦ ζῶντος, as antecedent, thus regarding the words *σῶλος—μυστήριον* as closely connected and parenthetical. But this would be very harsh : though even then it would equally prove the doctrine of the *incarnate Deity*.*

* In which view I would adduce the remarkable words of Schoettg. : “ Verba hæc ab Apostolo ideo proferuntur, ut ipsum

It ought to be sufficient, then, to determine us to retain the common reading, that the other is *not Greek*, in the sense contended for (and, therefore, no MSS. or Versions could justify it); and that the interpretation in question is supported by the most illustrious of the Greek Fathers, all the Greek Commentators and Scholiasts, and by almost all the antients, by whom *φανερῶσθαι ἐν σαρκὶ* is considered as applied to Christ in allusion to the miraculous and mysterious union of the Divine and human natures. And thus applied, i. e. to *Christ* (and not, as some maintain, to the *Gospel*), each of the following clauses has a definite and appropriate meaning and force. For (to use the words of Whitby, which are sufficiently exact to render any minute Critical examination of the phraseology unnecessary) 1st., He was God in the flesh, Joh. 3, 5., Phil. 2, 6 & 7. 2dly., He was justified by the Spirit (*ἐν πνεύματι*, by the influence or effusion of the Spirit), himself working miracles thereby, and his Apostles after him. Matt. 12, 28., Rom. 1, 3., Acts 2, 33. 3dly., He was seen by Angels, Heb. 1, 6., Luke 2, 9 & 13., Matt. 4, 11., Luke 22, 43., 24, 4. Acts 1, 10. 4thly., The whole history of the Gospel shows that he was preached unto the Gentiles, and believed on in the world. 5thly., He was received up into Heaven. Matt. 16., 19., Luke 24, 51., Acts 1, 2 & 11.

See also the admirable expositions of this passage by Bp. Pearson and Hurd, ap. D'Oyley and Mant, which render any further observations of my own superfluous; and I will only notice that the exposition thus laid down by the above illustrious *trio* of Theologians is, in every part, supported by the authority of the Greek Fathers and Commentators.

The *ἀγγέλους*, Benson and Mack. would understand of the *Apostles*. But that yields a very harsh sense, and, moreover, requires the article. Innovations in interpretation on slight grounds ought ever to be discouraged.

CHAP. IV.

Here there is the usual complaint, of the division of the chapter having been introduced at an improper place. But I can hardly think it well founded in the present instance; and the division in question is defended by the authority of Chrys., who commences a new Homily here. That proposed by the Commentators is, however, supported by the autho-

doceat, quemnam articulum præcipuè urgere debeat (vide v. 15.), nimirum illum, qui de Christo agit *θεανθρώπων*; quem Judæi non voluerunt agnoscere."

rity of Œcumen., who commences the new Chapter at καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, &c.

VERSE 1. τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει. The connection seems to be this: "Such, then, are the important doctrines which compose the great mystery of godliness, worthy of being ever remembered, and strenuously maintained (and especially now), since the Spirit speaketh expressly, &c. By the πνεῦμα some understand the Spirit, as exerted in the Prophets of the Old Testament: and Middleton and Benson think there is a reference to Dan. 11, 36—39. But that has been by most Commentators thought doubtful: and they refer it to the Apostle himself; and Benson supposes an immediate revelation. Certainly this is very suitable to the modesty of the Apostle: but it seems safer to extend it to the *prophetic spirit*, as imparted not only to Paul, but to others of the Apostles. So important a piece of information might very well be communicated to *several*.

1. ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς, i. e. not the last times, but the *latter* times, namely, those subsequent, and that were to come after (and perhaps long after) the Apostolic age: for of that circumstance the Apostle was probably not informed. This sense of ὑστερ. καιρ. is frequent in the best writers, as Thucyd., Herodot., Plato, and others.

Tives, some. How many, and in what proportion, it is not said; but the expression must, consistently with the usage of the best writers, signify a very considerable part. On the sects against whom the words are levelled, the Commentators are not agreed. In a work of this kind such discussions would be out of place; and, therefore, I must refer the reader to the best English Commentators, especially Mede, Bp. Newton, Whitby, Mackn., Benson, and others.

1. προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις, καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίαις. The best Commentators are agreed that by πνεύμασι πλάνοις are to be understood *false teachers, impostors*, who arrogated to themselves the

Spirit; as 1 Cor., 12, 10. Πλάνοις is, by most Commentators, regarded as a substantive put adjectively (for as to the reading πλάνης, it savours of gloss, or arose from the itacism); and they adduce examples of the adjectival use from Menander and other writers. I cannot but suspect that such was its *original* use, and that, like multitudes of other adjectives, it became a substantive, by the omission of the noun ἄνθρωπος. By διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων most modern Commentators understand doctrines concerning devils, or demons. It seems agreeable to the natural import of the words to take it, with the antients, and some moderns, of doctrines dictated by, and disseminated under, diabolical influence. So Theodoret: Ἐκείνων γὰρ ἀληθῶς κήρυματα ἐκείνα τὰ ῥήματα. Or, with others, the genitive may be taken for the cognate adjective, *devilish, impious*. See 1 Cor., 11, 15.

2. ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων. The *terms*, Heinr. observes, are clear; but the construction dubious. Hence the variety of opinions. Some, as Beza, fancy an antiptosis for ψευδολόγοις. Rosenm. renders, “propter simulationem falsorum doctorum.” Others refer the Genitives to δαιμονίων. Heinr. thinks that προσέχοντες is to be repeated, or ὄντες to be supplied before ἐν ὑπ.; q. d. ὄντες ψευδολόγοι ἐν (συν) ὑποκρίσει (i. e. καὶ ὑποκριταὶ) κεκαυτηριασμένοι, i. e. ὑποκριταὶ (καὶ ὁμως) ψευδολόγοι. On the *persons* here meant see Mackn. and Slade.

2. κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν. Here is another of the numerous points on which Commentators are at issue. Most explain it of those who suffer under the pangs of a self-reproving conscience; καυτήριον being the brand with which criminals were marked, and who then might be supposed to have cast off all shame. The expression has, therefore, been supposed to denote *self-convicted offenders*: and this is supported by the authority of Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen. Others, however, as many eminent moderns, think that it is derived from

the mode adopted by surgeons, of cauterizing, or searing, by which the part is rendered insensible to all feeling. So our English Translators, Beza, Pisc., Menoch., Schegel, Doddr., Mackn., Reitz on Lucian, 1, 645., Schleus., Slade, and Valpy. And this is supported by Theodoret: ὁ γὰρ τοῦ καυτήρος τόπος νεκρωθεὶς τὴν προτέραν αἰσθησιν ἀποβάλλει. So the Scholiasts. And, upon the whole, this appears to be the most agreeable to the context; though I am aware that minute exceptions may be taken against it. I would here compare Eph. 4, 19., οἵτινες ἀπηλγητότες, ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ: and also Zonar. Lex. 1566., τὸ πεπωρωμένον ἔχειν τὸν νοῦν.

3. κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων. It is well observed by Theodoret: οὕτως αὐτῶν τὴν διαφθορὰν τῶν δογμάτων δηλώσας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων νομίμων τὴν βδελυρίαν προλέγει. The forbidding to marry is, by some, thought to refer to the *Essenes*; by others, to the *Roman Catholics*. But it comes to the same thing; since many of the Romish superstitions were derived from the *Essenes*, who borrowed them from the East, where, as in a fruitful soil, Monkery and unnatural celibacy, with its odious train of vices, have ever thriven, as in a hot bed. See Mackn.

The peculiar idiom (called Synesis) at ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων contains an ellipsis deserving of especial attention, which most Commentators supply by κελεύοντων, or ποιούντων (with the Syr.); and they compare 1 Cor., 14, 34., οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσασθαι, where see the note. Rosenm. compares Phædr.: "non veto dimitti," verum cruciari fame. And Heinrichs, Thucyd. 7, 36., and Plin. H. N. 25, 5. Perhaps it might be best to compare this with those passages where, in the first clause, comes a verbum imperandi, with a negative; and in the second, the *verb* is to be repeated, without the negative. Now here the κωλύω includes within itself *both*: yet, in the second clause, a verbum imperandi is to be repeated, as in

the former case. So that there is also a kind of *κατὰ τὸ σημαινόμενον*.

Βρωμ. is rightly rendered *meats*, in our common acceptance; since it was animal food that was especially forbidden. See the note on Acts 2, 44. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς, &c. This ought to be rendered: "though God hath created, caused them to exist." *Εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας*, "for a thankful participation;" i. e. to be thankfully participated in, and enjoyed. *Τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνώκοσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, "by faithful and well instructed Christians." It is evident how this implies an obligation in those who partake of the bounty of God to return thanks to the giver; and, surely, such as habitually neglect this thanksgiving cannot be reckoned among those who know the truth, or obey it. Theodoret well paraphrases: *Μυσαρὸν γὰρ καὶ τὸν γάμον, καὶ τῶν βρωμάτων τὰ πλεῖστα ἀποκαλοῦσιν, ἵνα τὸν τοιούτων δημιουργὸν ἐνυβρίσωσι· ταῦτα μέντοι πεποίηκεν εἰς ἀπόλαυσον, ὥστε πρόφασιν ἐντεῦθεν τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας εἰς εὐχαριστίαν λαμβάνειν, καὶ χορηγὸν ἀνυμνεῖν*.

4, 5. *ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλὸν*. These words are, as it were, exegetical of the preceding *ἐπεγνώκοσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, "who know (I say)." *Πᾶν κτίσμα*, "every thing created and supplied by God is good and fit to be eaten." *Καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον*, "and no (created thing) is to be rejected," i. e. *ἀποβαλῆς ἄξιον*. Of this use of *ἀποβλ.* Wets. adduces examples. Rosenm compares Gen. 1, 30. Rom. 14, 6. and 1 Cor. 10, 30. *Μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον*, "if it be taken with thankfulness."

5. *ἀγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως*. These words do not so much give a *reason* (as the Commentators suppose) for the preceding, as they limit the foregoing position, and show that every *κτίσμα Θεοῦ* may become *καλὸν* (for that is the sense of *ἀγιάζεται*), namely, if it be partaken and enjoyed, *διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως*, "in conjunction with, preceded by the use of," &c. The *διὰ λόγου* is explained by Vorst., Dan., Grot., Hamm., Scult., and

almost all recent Commentators explain, "by the Gospel, which declares no meat impure." (See Acts 10, 15. and Rom. 14, 14.) And this *may* be the sense; but it is harsh thus to take *διὰ* here in a different signification; and I therefore prefer (with the antients and some moderns, especially Heinr.) to take it of "the word of man spoken in honour of God;" and thus there will be an hendiadis. So Œcumen. 231 c. δι' εὐχῆς πρωθύστερον δὲ κείμεναι διὰ γὰρ λόγου καὶ ἐντεύξεως τῆς πρὸς θεὸν γινομένης. Theophyl.: σφράγισον (I conjecture σφάγισον) εὐχαρίστησον, δόξασον τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἀποπίπτει ἡ ἀκαθαρσία. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ εὐχαριστία, πάντα καθαρίζει· ὁ ἀχάριστος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκαθάρτος καὶ μιαινός. And Theodoret: τὸ φύσει καλὸν μετ' εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ μνήμῃ καὶ ἅγιον ἀποφαίνεται. What, then, must we think of those *Christian heathens* who neglect this *ιατρεία*?

6. ταῦτα ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. By the ταῦτα is meant not only what just preceded, but also what was mentioned at c. 3. Perhaps, too, ταῦτα carries with it, as in the Classical writers, the notion of *τοιαῦτα*. The term ὑποτίθ., which properly signifies *submonere*, is very appropriate to that mildness and delicacy in inculcating Christian truth so becoming a minister of the Gospel. Thus Theophyl. observes, that the Apostle does not say ἐπιτάττων. See Schleus. Lex. Ἐσθ, "thou wilt be." Ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως—διδ. There seems to be an ellipsis, which may be thus supplied: "(and this may be expected of you) who have been nourished up in the words," &c. A Classical phrase with which Wets. compares Vellej. Paterc. 2, 94. Innutritus cœlestium præceptorum disciplinis. And Seneca ad Polyb. 21. liberalibus disciplinis innutritus. See also Loesn. Ἡ παρηκολούθηκας, which thou hast followed up, learned, and professed." The word, Rosenm. observes, is so used in Plato. And so 2 Tim. 3, 10. See the note on Luke 1, 3. παρ' ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς.

7. τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γεαυδεῖς μύθους παραιτοῦ,

“Reject the superstitious fables, whether of Jews or Gentiles.” This sense of *παριτ.* for *ἀποστρέφειν* is found in the best writers. By the *βεβήλους* the Apostle is thought to have reference to the fables of the *people*; and by the *γραῶδεις*, to those of the *Rabbins*; which, indeed, if we may judge by the specimens found in them, deserve the name. Not but that they would be *applicable* to the *heathen superstitions*; but they both seem to have reference to *Jewish superstitions*; and the *βεβ.* may advert to some that were especially akin to the Pagan ones, and introduced from them, probably those of the *Essenes*; though that is uncertain. See the Commentators, who, however, rise no higher than conjecture. The name *μυθ.* denotes the falsity and vanity of these superstitions.

Of the latter expression Wets. adduces an example from Strabo, 1. p. 32. Ἀ τὴν ποιητικὴν γραῶδην μυθολογίαν ἀποφαίνων. I add Jambl. de V. Pyth. γραῶδεσιν ὑποθήκαις. On the *sentiment* I would compare Phil. Jud. 132 c. τῇ δὲ Θεοῦ θεραπευτῇ πρεπωδὲς ἀληθείας περιέχεσθαι τὴν ἀβέβαιαν μυθοποιῶν χαίρειν εἶποντι.

7. γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν. This is reckoned among the agonistical metaphors. Rosenm. compares Arrian 3, 22. πρὸς ἀρετὰς γυμνάζεσθαι. To which I add Max. Tyr. D. 31, 6. 11, 110. τοιοῦτος ἐξ ἀγαθῆς παλαίστρας ἀγωνιστὴς γίνεται, λόγων μεστὸς ἀκολακεύτων καὶ ἡσχημένων ὑγιῶς, καὶ δυναμένων ἄγειν πειθοῖ καὶ βίᾳ ἐκ πληκτικῇ τὸ πησιάζον πᾶν. The sentence is elliptical, and may be rendered: “examine thyself as to what regards virtue and piety.”

8. ἡ γὰρ σωματικὴ γυμνασία πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ὠφέλιμος. On the sense of the *σωματικὴ γυμνασία*, Commentators are divided in opinion; some understanding it literally of *gymnastic exercises* just mentioned.*

* So Wets., who paraphrases: “Alii in pueritiâ fabulas aniles libenter audiunt: tu, cùm puer esses, verbis fidei innutritus es; quanto magis te nunc pueritiâ egressum illas fabulas aspernari

Others think that the Apostle adverts to the exercising of the body by refraining from meat, wine, marriage, &c. Rosenm. is of opinion that both may be understood; namely, that exercising which centers in the *body*, as opposed to the cultivation of the mind and soul. At *ὀλίγον* must be understood *χρόνον*: and this suits the *first* mentioned interpretation. If the second be adopted, the *πρὸς ὀλίγον* may be taken as an adverbial phrase, and signify *little*.

8. ἡ δὲ εὐσεβεία—μελλούσης. By ἡ εὐσεβεία is meant *true Christian piety*, as opposed to the profane superstitions just mentioned. Πρὸς πάντα may be taken with the same latitude of signification as πρὸς ὀλίγον, and mean, “at all times, and in all places and circumstances. Ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς, &c. A somewhat unusual and refined sort of expression, signifying, “having in its power a promise (i. e. of happiness) respecting this life,” &c. For truly Christian piety, which affects not needless mortifications, as it were, *promises* and *confers those blessings*, of which it does not, like superstition, deprive its votaries. What these are, is obvious; namely, calmness and tranquillity of mind, even that peace of God which passeth all understanding, an enjoyment of all the innocent pleasures of life, and a hope full of immortality. On the *sentiment* Rosenm. compares Seneca Ep. 79.; and Wets., Aboth 4, 6. Magna est lex, quæ dat vitam facientibus ipsam in seculo præsentī, et in seculo futuro.

9. Πιστὸς—ἄξιος. On this formula see the note on 1, 15. It is doubted whether it ought to be referred to the *preceding*, or to the *following*. The

deceat? Adolescentes solent corpus exercere; at ego tibi adolescenti studium longè præstantius commendo: meditare doctrinam Evangelii, coerce corpus tuum ejusque appetitus, præpara te futuris casibus, mentem excole.” Rosenm. compares Pythag. ap. Stob. Serm. 1. ἰσχύειν τῇ ψυχῇ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ σώματι αἰροῦ. I add Diog. Daert. 1, 56. ἀθληταὶ δὲ καὶ ἀσκούμενοι, πολυδάπανοι καὶ νικῶντες ἐπιζημίοι.

former opinion (which is supported by the antients and most moderns) seems preferable. "Without (says Benson) these three grand principles, a *God*, a providence, and a future state, religion could not subsist. And the Apostle, in the next verse, plainly intimates that these were his support under afflictions, as well as animated him to zeal and diligence in active service."

10. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ—Θεῷ ζῶντι, "To this end we both labour and suffer persecution and insult." The var. lect. ἀγωνιζόμεθα is evidently *ex emendatione*. Ἐλπίζαμεν, "have hoped and do hope." Or it is used, like the aorist, of that which is customary, and habitual. Rosenm. well paraphrases: "Ideo laboribus maceror, obloquiis et conviviiis laceror, quia in Deo confido, nimirum, vitæ hujus meæ perpessitiæ in illâ alterâ rationem ab eo habitum iri." Cicero (he adds) thought for the mere acquiring of a deathless name (than which he accounted nothing greater or more desirable) labours were to be endured. And he cites Cic. Cat. Maj. Quis tantos labores diurnos nocturnosque domi militiæque susciperet, si iisdem finibus gloriam quibus vitam esset terminaturos? which possibly Milton had in view in the celebrated passage of Lycidas:

"Fame is the spur that the clear sp'rit doth raise
To scorn delights, and live laborious days,"

10. ὅς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων. This is well explained by Theophyl., "would have all men be saved;" and by Benson, "is disposed to be the Saviour," &c. See the note supra 1, 1. By πιστ. is, of course, meant *Christians*. Wets. compares a sentiment of Hierocl.: ἐστι μὲν δημιουργὸς πάντων, τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν καὶ πατὴρ—μισεῖ μὲν οὐδένα ἀνθρώπων, τὸν δὲ ἀγαθὸν διαφερόντως ἀσπάζεται and Plut. Alex. p. 683 A. καὶ λέγειν, ὡς πάντων μὲν ὄντα κοινὸν ἀνθρώπων πατέρα τὸν θεόν, ἰδίους δὲ ποιούμενον ἑαυτῷ τοὺς ἀρίστους.

12. μηδεὶς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω—ἀγνεία.

Considering the force of the second clause ἀλλὰ—ἐν λόγῳ, &c., it is plain that we must interpret this: "Let no one have reason to despise," &c. Ἀλλὰ may be rendered "but (in order thereto)." The verb to *despise*, followed by different nouns, as despise one's *youth* (i. e. despise one on account of one's youth), one's *number*, one's want of strength, &c. is not unfrequent in the Classical writers, from whom examples are cited by Wets. Ἐν λόγῳ, in speech (so Theophyl.); or, as some explain, *teaching*. Compare 5, 17. Ἐν ἀναστροφῇ, *conduct, behaviour*. "Thus (paraphrases Heinr.) exemplifying your doctrines by your conduct."

So far all is clear. But on the words following there is a difference of opinion. Ἐν ἀγάπῃ must *not* (with Heinr.) be united with the former, so as to form an hendiadis; but rather taken independently. For the four following particulars seem intended as *exemplifications* of the general term ἐν ἀναστροφῇ: and I cannot but censure the slovenly mode in which many eminent Commentators (see Benson and Heinr.) huddle up the terms of this sentence. Ἐν ἀγάπῃ is well explained by the antients, love to all men, whether Christians or not. The next particular, ἐν πνεύματι, is omitted in a few antient MSS. and Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb.; but very rashly and uncritically; since no good reason can be assigned for its insertion, but many for its omission (especially in MSS. like those, which have been tampered with), namely, from the acknowledged difficulty; for such there is, otherwise the Commentators would not have interpreted so variously; some understanding it of the *spiritual gifts*; others, of the *temper and disposition*. Yet as the antients (I find) universally explained it as having a reference to the *Holy Spirit*, so the correctors of the above MSS. saw not how it could have place among the duties of common life: for so many Commentators, antient and modern, seem to think. It must, however, I think, mean, "in a spiritual

frame or temper." So Theophyl.: ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ καταστάσει.

The πίστις cannot properly be regarded as having place among the duties of common life, unless it be interpreted (with Rosenm.) *fidelity*. But that sense is too precarious to be depended on: and I must equally censure the rashness of both correctors and interpreters on this passage, which being expressed popularly, must not be bound down to the rules of regular composition. Considering the context, it must be interpreted of faith, not as regards the internal feelings, but the *outward profession* of an undoubting confidence in God.

Ἀγνεία must refer to moral purity and chastity in general.

13. ἕως ἔρχομαι, i. e. "till I come mind these maxims, and then I will instruct you farther." (So Theophyl.) This is a popular expression, and must not be pressed on.

13. πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει.

Almost all the Commentators interpret this of *reading the Scriptures*, i. e. as far as they were then promulgated, namely, the Old Testament, (see 2 Tim. 3, 15 & 16), called *σῆμα*. And some think these are meant to be contrasted with the anile or, at least, unauthorized traditions of the Rabbis. But although the Apostle may be presumed to have intended especially to recommend the study of the Old Testament, yet I apprehend that he *also* has in view such reading or *study* in general as would contribute to the better *understanding* of the Scriptures, and the fitting Timothy for the exercise of teaching and preaching among the enlightened Gentiles. It is strange that so few Commentators should have seen this, among whom is Theodoret* and the judicious Dodd., and, in some measure, Benson. I am happy to fortify this interpretation by the authority of the learned professor Rutherford, in a most admirable *Concio ad Clerum*, intitled, *De artibus et doctrinis quibus Theologiæ studiosos erudiri oportet*, which I would respectfully recommend to the perusal of my clerical brethren. But as it is very scarce, I shall introduce the following important extract. "Paulus, cum Timotheo præcipiat, ut magno studio in lectionem

* Whose words are these: Ἐντεῦθεν ἐστὶ μαθεῖν, ὥς καὶ ἡμᾶς προσήκει συνεισφέρειν τὸν πόνοι, καὶ οὕτω λαμβάνειν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος· καὶ γὰρ τῷ τρισμκαρῷ Τιμοθέῳ πνευματικῶ ὄντι τῇ ἀναγνώσει προσέχειν ἐκέλευσεν ὁ διδάσκαλος.

incumbat, et Petrus, cum multo intellectu difficilia in sacris libris contineri dicat, quæ ab instabilibus indoctisque hominibus non sine ipsorum exitio pervertuntur, auctoritate suâ, fanaticos illos refellunt qui neminem Christiani Theologi munus ritè exequi posse aiunt, nisi vel nihil doctrinæ attigerit, vel si quàm forte puerili institutione adeptus fuerit, cum omnem ex animo suo penitus exterminaverit. Nobis autem, qui et ipsi gravissimum hoc munus suscepimus, et in alios qui idem suscepturi eruditionis causâ huc veniant, instituendos ac docendos curas nostras et cogitationes conferre debemus, quærendum est præterea quænam sint artium doctrinarumque studia, quæ efficiunt, ut, Spiritu Sancto nos adjuvante, idonei simus Novi Fœderis Ministri. Paulus præcepit, ut in quibus rerum sacrarum administratio committatur, tales sint, qui purum sincerumque Dei verbum, prout idem didicerint, firmiter retineant; qui possint benevolos auditores hortari ac docere, adversarios convincere, pervicaces, inaniter garrulos, fraudulentosque homines admonere, aut, si quando opus fuerit, acriter reprehendere; ut *seipso*s tales præbeant, quales *Deus probabit, opifices* qui nullam habeant erubescendi causam, et qui verbum veritatis ita distribuant; ut denique sunt ad docendum apti, et ad illos, qui sese veritati opponant, quive eam deserentes fabulos consectentur, eam comitate et mansuetudine, quatenus res sinat, erudiendos, p. 1—8. And again, p. 11. Quamvis igitur ineptum esset, quando inter indoctos concionamur, controversias Theologicas in orationibus nostris disceptare; orationum tamen nostrarum, quibus vel doctos vel indoctos ad veræ religionis scientiam erudimus, ex scriptis eorum a quibus disceptatæ sunt, materiam omnem petere oportet."

I would add, that on the utility, if not necessity, of profane literature to the formation of the Critical Interpreter of Scripture and useful Preacher of the word, we have the united opinion of the Fathers and the most eminent modern Theologians. *Chrys.* every where conjoins it: and I need only advert to his celebrated Dict. τῶν πάντων κακῶν αἴτιον μὴ ἀναγινώσκειν βίβλια, ψυχῆς φάρμακα. And so *Basil, Gr. Naz., Clem. Alex., Jerome, Isidor., Pelus., Phot.,* and indeed all the most eminent of the Greek Fathers. My limits will only permit me to insert the following passage of *Œcumen.* (partly from *Chrys.*) T. 1. p. 66 B and C., where commenting on the passage of the Acts, in which it is said that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, he remarks: 'Εκ τούτου δῆλον, ὡς οὐκ ἀποβλητέα πάντα ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν ἔξωθεν τῆς γραφῆς παιδείσιν· τρόπῳ γὰρ ἐγκωμίου εἴρηται, ὡς ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Ἀιγυπτίων, καὶ περὶ τῶν τριῶν παίδων καὶ Δανιὴλ, ὡς ὑπερέβαλλον πάντας ἐν τῇ Χαλδαίων φιλοσοφίᾳ, καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐπιστήμαις· δεῖ δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγον αὐταῖς προσέχειν, τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ ἐμμένοντας· οὔτε γὰρ Μωϋσῆς, οὔτε οἱ περὶ Ἀνανίαν καὶ Δανιὴλ ἔμαθον ἂν τὴν ξένην παιδείαν, εἰ μὴ πού φαίη ἂν τις, ὅτι καλὸν αὐτὴν μαθεῖν πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέψαι τὰς ἐκείνων ἀπάτας. On this important subject I may be excused for referring my readers to a Visitation Sermon (or rather *Essay*, with copious notes,) published by me nearly eleven years

ago, in which is especially evinced the necessity of learning to a Theologian, by an examination of the chief requisites for forming a skilful Interpreter of the Sacred Writings. I would also refer my reader to Dr. Maltby's Serm. vol. 2, 557. and to J. H. Paræus Instit. Instr. Vet. Test. sub. init. p. 1. Sect. 1. *De studiis, cum probabili Veteris Testamenti interpretatione indivulso nexu conjunctis*; and Sect. 3. *De subsidiariis studiis, quæ ingenuum Veteris Testamenti interpretem ornent et adjuvent*. Nor must I omit to mention a very acute defence of learning, &c. as necessary to a Theologian, to be found in an Appendix to *Sanctus Sancitus* by Dr. Kendall, Lond. 1654. fol., intitled, "An Appendix against *Master Horne*, goring all University Learning."

The Philological student will, however, bear in mind, that by *reading* is here meant that vigorous exercise of the mind in thought upon any subject, which can alone convert what is read to nourishment. In which view I would introduce a most judicious observation from an author in whom we should little expect it, Artemid. Onir. 1, 12. p. 1, p. 25. Ed. Reif. *φημι δεῖν οἴκοθεν παρασκευασθαι καὶ οἰκεία συνέσει χρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ μόνον τοῖς βιβλίοις ἐπανεχεῖν—ἀτελής καὶ ἀπέραντος*. Finally, in the words of the Poet, *Γράμματα μαθεῖν δεῖ, καὶ μαθόντα νοῦν ἔχειν*.

13. *τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*. Since the Apostle puts *τῇ ἀναγνώσει* first, and then *τῇ παρακλήσει* and *τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*, I think, with Heinr., that he intended to represent the usefulness of the first, in order to the more effectual production of the other two.

14. *μὴ ἀμέλει—πρεσβυτερίου*. The word *χάρισμα* here denotes, according to its usual signification, the New Testament, a *supernatural gift of the Spirit*; though many recent Commentators endeavour to explain all away by lowering the sense to *dotes animi*, &c. (See Noesselt Exerc. p. 80. or Rosenm., who faithfully details this interpretation, which he himself adopts.) Though even Benson (prone as he is to innovation) here strenuously maintains the former signification of *χάρισμα*, which he says occurs not only in the New Testament, but the *Apostolical Fathers*. (See his note.)

By the *μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*, I agree with Benson, we are to understand the laying on of hands in addition to those of the Apostle. For at 2 Tim. 1, 6. the gift is said to have been imparted by the laying on of the hands of Paul. Yet I cannot

agree with him that we may infer that the Elders did not confer it. They, it should seem, *contributed* to confer it; though in what proportion we are not told; neither is it necessary for us to know. On the rite of laying on of hands see the Commentators and Vitranga de Synag. vet. p. 507.

15. ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι, “hæc meditare, et in his totus esto.” (Rosenm.) Both these phrases, as used of diligent attention, and devoted care, are found in the best Classical writers; the latter in the Latin as well as the Greek. (See Wetstein’s examples.) The ἴνα has perhaps the eventual sense. On the exact force of the above phrases see Benson.

15. ἐν πᾶσιν, “inter omnes.” Theophl. and others interpret “in all things.”

16. ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ—σου. Heinr. takes this for an hendiadis; q. d. “take heed how thou teachest.” But this is paring down the sense. The antients and most moderns rightly explain the σεαυτῷ, “thy own conduct and life; and διδ., “thy doctrine.” At ἔπεχε (like πρόσεχε) there is an ellipsis of νοῦν; and ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς is rendered by Rosenm., “his esto intentus;” as ἐπίστηθι at 2 Tim. 4, 2., and the ἐπείκεισο of Heysch.

Then it is added τοῦτο γὰρ—σου. By σῶσεις, as regards the ἀκούοντας is meant, “be the means of saving them; contribute to their salvation;” which is all that this popular form signifies. For we are not to suppose that even thus they would *all* ultimately be saved.

CHAP. V.

VERSE 1, 2. Πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς, “Do not roughly rebuke an elder man.” Ἐπιπλήσσειν signifies properly to *strike upon*; and is used of sharp reproof. The Commentators compare the Horatian patruæ verbera linguæ. Παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα, “use exhortation such as to a father.” Agreeable to the

custom of antiquity, by which old men were treated as fathers, of which Wets. adduces numerous examples; as Diog. Laert. Plat. 3, 95. εἰ πρὸς πρεσβυτέρους ἀμαρτάνοντας διαλέγεται, ἀρμόττοντας δὲ λόγους ὡς πρεσβυτέροις διαλέγεσθαι, and Phocyl. 209. (an imitation of this *pseudo*): πρέσβυν ὁμήλικα πατρὸς Ἰσאים τιμαῖσι γέraitε. But the Apostle skilfully engrafts on this other corresponding directions.

2. ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνείᾳ, i. e. not only with chastity, but, as the πάσῃ implies, with every caution, so as not to give the slightest handle for any suspicion. As an example of νεώτερος and νεότερας I would refer to Artemid. Onir. 1, 31.

3. χήρας τίμα τὰς ὄντως χήρας. The term τιμ. must here be taken in a peculiar sense, i. e. not strictly, *honour*, but rather, “give them what their rights may claim.” Now in the present instance this must comprehend not only *respect*, but *sustenance*. See Schleus. Lex. Τὰς ὄντως χήρας, “those that really answer to that description;” * which is further explained at ver. 5. It has not been a little debated whether these are to be regarded as the same with the *deaconesses*. This would seem to be doubtful: nor have we sufficient knowledge of the state of the primitive Church to be able to determine the question. See the Commentators, especially Benson and Heinr.

4. εἰ δὲ τις χήρα—εὐσεβεῖν. The ἔκγονα may signify *descendants*, *children*, *grand-children*, or, as it might happen, *great-grand-children*; (which in a country where marriages are contracted so early, would sometimes be the case even before the sixtieth year). Μανθανέτωσαν, scil. τὰ ταῦτα τὰ τέκνα, *let them learn*; not “from their mother, or grand-mother” (as Heinr. explains), but “from me who sig-

* On this sense of ὄντως, as applied to an epithet, Rosenm. cites Hierocl. in Pyth. ὁ ὄντως πατήρ. I add Dionys. Hal. 1, 541, 33. τὰ κοινὰ ὄντως κοινὰ, Athen. 571 c. τῶν ὄντως ἐταίρων, and 572. ὄντως ἐταίρας.

nify to them the will of God." Others, with less probability, think there is here a transition from the singular to the plural. It is more correct to say, that the whole construction is *popular*.

Εὐσεβεῖν is said by Rosenm. to be synonymous with τιμ. a little before. But there is this difference, that as the duty towards parents is so closely connected with that towards God, and so expressly enjoined by Him, the same term εὐσεβεῖν was used to denote both; as *pious, pietas*, &c. in the Latin. Τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον is, by a delicacy of language, put for *their parents*; though this is directly expressed in the clause following, which is exegetical of the preceding.

With the duty derived from *Divine sanction* the Apostle interweaves that which even *human reason and equity* would teach; and this is indicated by the καὶ ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις, which can require no explanation; nor can the phrase need those numerous examples so laboriously piled up by the Philological Commentators.

The πρῶτον, at which Heinr. causelessly stumbles, hints that they are first to support those of their own family, and afterwards those of the Christian society at large.

5. ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα—ἡμέρας. The δὲ is resumptive; and this sentence explains what the Apostle meant by χήρα, namely, *destitute*, i. e. of husband or children, or of any other means of support.* The words following are meant to hint at the other qualifications required, in order to entitle such an one to the τιμὴ in question, namely, sound Christian principles and belief, and a constant attendance on the external observances of piety. Of the sense here of ἡλπ. as spoken of what is *habitual*, there is an exam-

* The word is by the Commentators and Lexicographers derived from χῆρος, and that from χηρόω. But that verb is rather a derivative of χῆρος, which seems to come from χέω, cognate with χάω, *to gape, stand apart from, want the assistance of*. So the following μεμονωμένη. I would compare Eurip. Alc. 1110. χερεύεις μόνος;

ple supra 4, 10. where see the note. After Θεὸν Theophyl. and Heinr. supply *μόνον*.

6. ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα, ζῶσα τέθνηκε, "But she that liveth in luxury." That such is the sense is plain from James 5, 5. ἐτρυφήσατε καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε. This verb comes from σπατάλη, which is derived from σπάτος, *the hide, or skin*. It is not, however, used (as Schleus. says) *de cutis pruritu*; but there is rather a reference to *currying*, or taking care of the skin or flesh; which is a metaphor denoting *luxury*. So Hor. Ep. 1, 4, 15. Me pinguem et nitidum, bene curatâ cute, vises. The Commentators compare σπαθᾶν. See Heysch. Suic. Thes., and Loesner.

The metaphor in the words ζῶσα τέθνηκε is frequent both in the Rabbinical and Classical writers (especially the Philosophers), from whom Wets. adduces examples; as Jalk. Rubeni, and Seneca Ep. 77. I add Plutarch in frag. Stob. 35. p. 364. ὁ τῶν ἀσώτων βίος ὥσπερ κατ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκων ἐκφέρεται, and Joseph. 1320, 3. ἕως δὲ εἰσὶν ἐν σώματι θνήτῳ δεδεμένῳ καὶ τῶν τούτου κακῶν συναναπίπλυνται, τὸ ἀληθέστατον εἰπεῖν τεθήκασιν. See the note on Eph. 2, 1. The sense is: "She that is such may be regarded as spiritually dead, no longer a member of Christ's Church, and therefore having no claims to alms bestowed on poor Christians."

8. εἰ δὲ τις—χείρων. The Apostle here enforces the direction he had given at ver. 4. on the maintenance of poor widows by their children or grandchildren; namely, by urging that if they do not so, they will show less natural feeling and sense of religious obligation than the very Heathens. Heinr. however, thinks that the words are said of the *widows themselves*, and state the third requisite, namely, that they have been good mothers of families. But this is very harsh.

At the οἰκείων many Interpreters stumble; some rendering it, "of the household of faith;" and others, as Doddr. (running into needless distinctions), "those that reside in the same house:" and even

Heinr. adopts this ill-founded criticism. The truth is, that the words καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκείων are exegetical of the τῶν ἰδίων, and denote all *near relations*; a sense frequent in the Classical writers; as Thucyd. 2, 51.

8. ἡρνηται is to be taken as an aorist, “*denieth the faith*,” i. e. denies and rejects by his works that faith which he professes with his lips; i. e. is guilty of practical infidelity. Compare Tit. 1, 16. So Procop. Goth. p. 336. (cited by Wets.) ὁ τῇ φύσει τὸ πιστὸν ἔχων, οὐ ξυμμεταβάλλει τῇ τύχῃ τὴν γνώμην—ὁ γὰρ τὸ τῆς διανοίας νοσῶν ἄστατον, καὶ τὴν εἰς τοὺς φιλάττους ἡρνήσατο πίστιν. I add Liban. Orat. 828. ὁ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους πονηρὸς, οὐκ ἂν γένηται περὶ τὰ κοινὰ βελτίων. Among the Greeks, he who refused or neglected to do this was made ἀτίμος, and deprived of every political franchise. By the *faith* is meant the moral law adopted into the Gospel. So Is. 58, 7. ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τῶν σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψει.

8. καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χείρων, i. e. simply, “he is less observant of the moral and relative duties than an infidel;” for such were little negligent of *those* duties. So Tacit. (cited by Wets.) Liberos cuique ac propinquos Natura carissimos esse voluit. See Theophyl.

9. χήρα καταλεγέσθω. What is meant here by χήρα the Commentators are not agreed. Some think it denotes the Deaconesses mentioned supra, ch. 3. (See Benson and Dodd.) Thus it would be a name of *honour*. So Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. cited by Rosenm.: ἀσπάξομαι τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας. Others think that these χήραι were *poor widows* (properly so called) put on a list, for sustenance at the expense of the Church. Rosenm. says, that besides the *general roll* which comprehended all the Christians of any Church, there were particular ones confined to the clergy, and those poorer Christians who were maintained at the public expense, including virgins and widows; and of such lists the Ecclesiastical Canons often make mention.” The Apostle’s

meaning is obscure ; yet the latter opinion seems the more probable : and the age at which they might be elected seems to strengthen it ; for the sixtieth year was that at which (as we learn from the Rab- bins and Classical writers) old age was supposed to commence. The verb ἐγκαταλέγω, which signifies to enter upon a list, would equally suit *both*.*

It should seem that before the sixtieth year they might receive *casual relief*, but were not put on the list for *regular maintenance*. Upon the whole, how- ever, it is impossible, without more knowledge of the circumstances of the primitive Church, to come to any determination of such a question.

On the sense of ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή, the Commentators are equally divided in opinion as upon the μιᾶς γυναι- κὸς ἄνδρα, supra 3, 2. Most explain it, “ a wife of one husband, one who has had but one husband.” Others, “ who has had only one husband at a time.” Others again, “ a wife who has preserved her con- jugal fidelity.” And so, besides some eminent mo- derns, as Rosenm. and Doddr., Theodoret : δῆλον, ὡς οὐ τὴν διγαμίαν ἐκβάλλει, ἀλλὰ τὸ σωφρόνως ἐν γάμῳ βιοῦν νομοθετεῖ. But I must confess this seems not a little harsh ; and the first mentioned is by far the most natural interpretation.†

* Jaspis, who adopts the latter opinion, observes, that with this *entering upon a list* was (as we learn from Jerome), in order to in some measure compensate the Church for its bounty, conjoined an obliga- tion to undertake certain public functions, perform business of a lighter kind, suited to one in the decline of life. “ These widows (adds he) assisted the Deaconesses properly so called, and were called πρεσβυτιδες. (See Tit. 2, 3. Theophyl. on this place calls them τὰς γραιίδας, and Theodoret τὰς γεγηρακνίας.) Epiphanius expressly distinguishes τὰς γραστέρας πρεσβυτιδας, from the common Dea- conesses, and at the same time adds that they were χήραι.

† Because the Latins used the word *univira* to denote a woman who from her virginity had been married only to one man ; and be- cause that kind of monogamy was reckoned honourable in some of the Heathen priests and priestesses, Mackn. thinks that the cor- ruptors of Christianity enjoined these things to Christian Bishops, and Deacons, and widows, that they might, in the eyes of the peo- ple, be nothing inferior to the Heathen priests and priestesses.

10. ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη. See the note on 3, 7. The literal sense is: borne testimony to for good works." Ἐν is for ἐπὶ. These good works are then exemplified; so that εἰ may be rendered *if, for example*. The εἰ is, however, for ὅτι. (See Devar. and Hoogev.) Ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, *brought up, educated*. Now the *context* implies a careful, sober, and religious education. So Theophyl.: ὡς δεῖ. See also Theodoret. I cannot think with Heinr., that the *bearing* of children is here especially insisted on, however dishonourable sterility might be. And the *Jus trium liberorum* can have no bearing on the present case. It should rather seem that the Apostle did not intend any objection to be made to a widow, that she had not borne children. Εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφ. may mean, "if she has carefully educated such children as she has had," whether any, or none. And in the same manner the εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν and εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν, may only mean, "if she has shown all hospitality to strangers, and rendered all assistance to the poor, which the circumstances of her husband and family permitted."* On ἐξενοδ. see the note on 3, 2. The ἐξενοδοχ. being followed by the εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν (put exegetically) shows that the strangers are supposed to be (as they would usually be) Christians.

The *washing of the feet* (on which see Joh. 13, 14. and the note there) is put, to denote, in a general way, kind attention to the comfort of the guests; and in the East *this* is reckoned one of the greatest; and other domestic attentions, were rendered either personally by, or under the superintendence of,

* Mackn. irrationally argues, from the *expensiveness* of such hospitality and assistance, that these widows could not have done it at their own charges, but were female Deacons employed in these offices at the common expense; and that in choosing widows, Timothy was to prefer those who had been Deaconesses; but this is making confusion worse confounded. *Lodging* was not expensive; and the rest would depend upon their ability. They might, or they might not, have been Deaconesses: but the Apostle has (I think) reference to nothing of the sort.

the wives, or other females of the family. See Wetstein's examples, to which I add Herodot. 6, 19, 9.

10. εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν, "if she hath relieved the distressed.* Of this sense of ἐπαρκέω many examples are adduced by Wets. Θλιβομένοις, *distressed*. See Bp. Pearson's notes to Ignat. Epist. p. 17.

The Apostle then (Theodoret observes), συλλήβδην ἅπαντα τῆς ἀρετῆς εἶπε τὰ εἶδ. sums up the whole, by the words ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησε, where ἐπηκ. is very significant, and denotes, "followed up, and lost no opportunity of performing." So διώκειν, 1 Thess. 5, 15. and Heb. 12, 14.

11. Νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ, "but the younger ones reject (as applicants to be put upon this list)." In the next words ὅταν γὰρ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖν θέλουσιν, the phraseology is very brief and obscure. Heinr. regards the words as an inversion, for ὅταν γὰρ γαμεῖν θέλουσιν, καταστρηνιάζουσιν κατὰ τοῦ Χ.; which may be true; but something is required to be supplied; thus: "For being restrained from marrying again, and sometimes having a wish so to do, they are apt to kick at the restraints of the Christian faith, and take a second spouse." It should seem that these χήραι engaged themselves to the performance of certain duties inconsistent with a married state, and that a promise (or vow) of remaining single was expected of them, on being entered on the list.

The term καταστρην. is variously explained. By some (as Schleus., in his *Lexicon*), "to live luxuriously on the alms of the Church." But this seems neglecting the sense of κατὰ. I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation, supported by the antients and most moderns, and which is well expressed by Heinr. thus: "præ nimiâ luxuriâ et

* Theoph. explains, "by money, patronage, and intercession." And Theodoret observes: Οὐ τὴν ποσότητα τῆς χορηγίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς γνώμης ζητεῖ τὴν ποιότητα· τοιαῦτα ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐαγγελίοις χήρας τὰ δύο λεπτὰ.

opum affluentia insultare Christo et ejus religioni," i. e. swell against, rebel, and kick against. Compare 1 Sam. 2, 29. and Deut. 32, 15. which St. Paul seems to have had in view. The word comes from *στρηνής*, which signifies *stiff, starch, rough*, (whence *strenuus*,) also *swelling, rebellious*.

12. ἔχουσαι κρίμα ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν. On the sense of these words the Commentators are at issue. Many recent ones think that ἠθέτησαν τὴν πρώτην πίστιν denotes, "cast off the Christian faith;" and they render κρίμα *condemnation*. This interpretation, indeed, the expression might well bear; but it is very harsh: for nothing has been said about their having abandoned the religion, except that some fancy that the marriage could only be with a Heathen husband; which seems an unfounded fancy. The most rational interpretation seems to be that of the antients, and some eminent moderns, who explain, "to the breaking of their promise, or vow of remaining unmarried." And thus ἔχουσαι κρίμα will signify, "incurring condemnation." This sense of πίστις is of perpetual occurrence: and thus πρώτην admits of an apter sense than on the new interpretation. See Chrys., Theophyl., Œcumen., Theodoret, Scult, Camer., and others. It is plain, however, that κρίμα must here be taken in the sense condemnation; q. d. "they will commit a great sin by breaking so solemn a vow."*

13. ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας. The Apostle means to say, that with the younger widows this maintenance at the public expence will engender the vices which idleness ever produces in those who are able to work. By the use of the *present* tense here and in the former verse, I

* It is manifest how widely the case of these widows differs from that of the *nuns* of the Romanists. The former bound themselves by such a vow for the purpose of greater usefulness; whereas the latter, by wholly secluding themselves from the world, deprive themselves of all opportunity of this kind.

cannot but think (with Theophyl.) that the Apostle adverts to what had really happened, and was happening.

Ἄργαί μανθάνουσι, sub. οὔσαι, for εἶναι: a common Grecism. Other interpretations are proposed; but none that have any semblance of truth. See Wolf and Heinr. Φλύαροι καὶ περιέργοι, triflers* and busy-bodies, curious, prying into what does not concern them;† and consequently λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δεόντα. The οὐ μόνον hints that the vices following are engendered by idleness. Theophyl. well annotates thus: Περιοδεύουσαι γὰρ τὰς οἰκίας, οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ τὰ ταύτης πρὸς ἐκείνην φέρουσι, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνης εἰς ταύτην· καὶ ἀναγκαίως εἰς περιεργίαν ἐκ τοῦ ἐρευνᾶν πάντα, καὶ φλυαρίαν, ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν τὰ πάντων πρὸς πάντας, ἐκτραχηλίζονται.

13. λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δεόντα. A sort of *euphemism*, signifying, “talking scandal;” a vice with which the fair sex have been in all ages *charged*. So Eurip. Phœn. 205. φιλόψογον δὲ χρῆμα θηλειῶν ἔφυ Σμικρὰς δ' ἀφορμὰς ἦν λάβωσι τῶν λόγων, Πλείους ἐπεισφέρουσιν ἡδονὴν δὲ τις γυναιξί, μὴδὲν ὕγιες ἀλλήλας λέγειν.

14. βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμεῖν. It is strange that our Common Version and Benson should render “*younger women*,” when both the antients and almost all moderns are agreed that it can only mean the younger *widows*, of whom the context speaks. With respect to the βούλομαι, it must not be ren-

* The term comes from φλύος, a bubble, such as rises in soap and water: a fit image of worthlessness; and to blow up such well designates the *strenua inertia* of the trifler. By referring the metaphor to water boiling over, and interpreting this term of the *fermentation* with which trifling persons give vent to their feelings, Doddr. himself φλυαρεῖ. Nor was Wets. much better employed in heaping together examples of such common words as φλύαρος and its derivatives.

† This busy, curious, prying spirit is admirably depicted in a masterly sketch of Theophr. Char. Eth. Wetstein's examples show how much the word περιεργ. was associated with terms denoting *garrulity*. Indeed, as the Poet says, “For who talks much, must talk in vain.”

dered, with Mackn. and others, I *order, command*. It rather unites injunction and advice. Here it has been justly argued that St. Paul permits second marriages; nay, Doddr. observes that it would be a very great objection against *Christianity* if second marriages were condemned by it! Which is very true; but it is one thing to *permit*, and another to *approve*: and here the Apostle's approbation cannot be inferred: for I agree with those Commentators (as Grot.) who think that the *βούλομαι* is to be taken *comparatè*; q. d. "I wish them to marry again, if they are so inclined and have opportunity, rather than aim at what they cannot attain," namely, a dedicating of themselves, by celibacy, to the promotion of the Gospel.

The words *τεκνογονεῖν* and *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* signify, to exercise and occupy themselves in the duties of a wife. And the following *μηδεμίαν—χάριν* show the *good* which might be expected to result from such constant occupation, namely, that they would avoid the temptations of idleness, and give no handle of calumny to the adversaries of the faith. Compare Luke 21, 15. 1 Cor. 16, 9. Phil. 1, 28. 2 Thess. 2, 5. In *τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ*, as Heinr. observes, we have the singular for the plural; as often. *Λοιδορίας χάριν* is for *λοιδορίας ἕνεκα*, and stands in the place of *εἰς λοιδορίαν*, *quod attinet ad*, &c.

15. *ἤδη γὰρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ*. This is thought to denote defection from the Christian faith; *ἐκτρ.* signifying, metaphorically, to forsake a direct road. *Satan*, they say, stands for idolatry and heathenism, supported by Satan: and *ὀπίσω*, they observe, with verbs of *going*, signifies to *follow*. Perhaps the phrase *ἔξετ. ὀπ. Σατ.* may also denote a *practical* abandonment of the Gospel by such conduct as is inconsistent both with the letter and the spirit of it.

16. *εἴ τις—ἐπαρκέσῃ*. "But if *any* (whether male or female)." The *πιστὸς ἢ πιστὴ* may be com-

pared with the νεωτέρους and νεωτέρας, supra ver. 2. Ἔχει χήρας, "hath widows as near relations." Ἐπαρκεῖτω αὐταῖς, "let him or her relieve their wants." See supra, ver. 10. Ἵνα ταῖς ὄντως χήραις ἐπαρκέσῃ, "relieve those who are really destitute." See supra, ver. 3. It is rightly observed by the antients and some eminent moderns, that the Apostle plainly intends no more than bare sustenance. On this subject (important, as being the principle on which any system for the support of the poor ought to be founded), see an admirable Discourse of Dr. Maltby, vol. 2.

17. οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούθωσαν.

From the *relief of the poor* the Apostle proceeds to the *support of the Clergy*; and here we are left as much in the dark as on many other matters treated of in the former part of the Epistle. That a stipend was appropriated to the support of the ministry, we learn from 1 Cor. : but, whether fixed or varying, whence arising, and to what amount, we know not, nor, indeed, could expect to learn from the *Apostle*, whose delicacy forbids his entering into particulars; and ecclesiastical history supplies little information. We may, however, suppose that the stipend varied according to circumstances, i. e. the expense to be incurred by subsistence in various places. That it was *not* left to chance collection is very probable; else how could any minister regulate his expenses? That in all cases it then never exceeded what was absolutely necessary for a decent maintenance, we may very well suppose from the poverty of the contributors. Much more might be said on this subject, but on a point to which we might apply the words of Eurip. (ap. Plut. 2, 768.) Μάντις δ' ἄριστος, ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς, I forbear.

The προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι are generally admitted to be the Presbyters who presided over the rest (who, Benson thinks, are the first-fruits of Ephesus) and over the Church of any place.* Ἀξιοῦσθαι τινος, like the Latin *dignari*, is used of the *obtaining* any thing any one is thought worthy of, and is almost always used in a good sense.

* Now the worthily and judiciously presiding over it required no ordinary talents and great exertion. In all assemblies (as observes Benson) the regularity or irregularity of their proceedings depends very much on the wisdom and conduct of such as preside. The due discharge of the work of *presiding* (especially in that infant state of the Church, and when they were surrounded with enemies) required great prudence and application; and the flourishing or decay of the Christian Church did very much depend upon their management.

Of these it is said, that they shall have double *τιμὴ*, by which we are not merely to understand (with some) *respect*, but also, considering the context, *provision*. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): τὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων χορηγίαν. And on this most of the recent Commentators are agreed. See Wolf's *Curæ*, and a Dissertation of Floder on this subject, referred to by Schl. Lex. There is no doubt but both *respect* and *provision* are meant; and, considering the *smallness* of the stipend that the infant Churches could afford, there is little question but that it might very properly have been *doubled*. As, however, the *τιμῆς* seems *also* to import *respect*, and as the Apostle never elsewhere descends to particulars of this kind,* I agree with many eminent moderns that the διπλῆς τιμῆς is put (determinate for indeterminate) to denote a *much greater stipend*. So Theodoret explains πλειόνος. And so Chrys. and Theophyl., πολλῆς a liberal stipend. Of this signification of διπλ. Schleus. examples from Ap. 18, 16. Soph. Œd. Tyr. 1328. διπλᾷ σε πενθεῖν, καὶ διπλᾷ φέρειν κακὰ and Æschyl. Ag. 546. And many may be found in the Old Testament. So also Shakspeare: "Double double, toil and trouble." Wets., indeed, adduces passages where mention is made of soldiers who, for services, had double pay assigned them, and who were called *δμοιρίται* and *duplarii*. But there is (I think) at most only an *allusion* to that custom.

On the expediency of a liberal provision being made for a Priest, there ought not to be any doubt. The chief reason is well expressed by Theophyl. thus: καὶ γὰρ δεῖ τοὺς διδασκάλους ἀφθονίᾳ περιβρεῖσθαι τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἵνα μὴ περισπώμενοι περὶ ταῦτα, ἀμελῶσι τῆς διδασκαλίας. See an excellent note of Whitby in loc.

The use of the term *τιμὴ* to denote this stipend, may very well be reckoned among the delicacies of Greek phraseology and of the Apostle. See Heinr., who refers to Acts 28, 10. and Sir. 38, 1., and says the Rabbins so explain כבד in Num. 22, 16. See Schleus. Lex. V. T.

17. μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ. Rosenm. compares Acts 6, 4., and observes that there were then many inspectors of a congregation, of whom some had only the public care of the Church; others taught the people. Benson renders: "if they *also* diligently teach the Christian doctrine." He (it seems), like Heinr. and Rosenm., took the λόγῳ and διδασκαλίᾳ for an hendiadis; which *may* be correct; but the former seems to respect *public teaching*; and the latter, *private instruction*.

* And very rarely the Ecclesiastical writers. Yet in a passage of Euseb. H. E. L. 5, 28. (cited by Wets.) there is mention made of a *Sectarian Bishop* being engaged ὥστε λαμβάνειν μηνιαῖα δηναρία ρη'.

18. λέγει γὰρ—αὐτοῦ. In order to establish the claim of ministers to subsistence, the Apostle adduces two passages from Scripture, one from Deut. 25, 14., but here applied figuratively (see the note on 1 Cor. 9, 9.); the other is said, by Rosenm., to have been added by St. Paul *de suo*. Yet the καὶ must mean, “and again in another part of Scripture.” Now it *does* occur at Matt. 10, 10.; and that St. Paul had, at the time he wrote this Epistle, seen the Gospel of St. Matt., at least, in the first Hebrew edition, none can well doubt: and on account of this having been recorded as uttered by our Lord, and being in substance to be found at Deut. 24, 14. and Levit. 19, 13., the Apostle is justified in the use of the expression.

It is plain, from what precedes, that πρεσβ. must here mean a *Presbyter*, not an *elderly person*, as some explain. See Whitby. Παραδ. implies a ready admission of any story. See Raphel in loc. Ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ, *except*. See 1 Cor. 14, 5. 15, 2. and the notes. Δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων. So Deut. 19, 15. Matt. 18, 16. Joh. 8, 17.

20. τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγε. It is not quite agreed whom the Apostle means by the ἁμαρτ., whether the *Presbyters*, or the *people at large*. The context seems to favour the *former* opinion, which is adopted by Benson and others; but the air of the sentence and the change of number require the latter, which the antients and most moderns, with reason, prefer. All persons, then, of whatever class, sex, or age, &c., are intended.

Heinr. would transpose ver. 19 & 20. But instances of slight irregularity like the present are not unfrequent.

On the mode of this ecclesiastical correction Chrys. and Theophyl. have some admirable remarks. They explain the τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας: τοὺς ἐπιμένοντας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, καὶ οὐς εὖρης μετὰ ἐρεῦνης. And they remark on the equally pernicious effects of excessive severity and of extreme lenity.

The words *ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσι* hint at the only legitimate end of punishment, namely, not the gratification of the ill-humour of the punisher, but the prevention of the crime.

21. *διαμαρτύρομαι—πρόσκλησιν*. A most solemn injunction, on which Benson may be consulted; though he, as often, runs into needless refinements. It seems to have regard to all that went before in this Chapter. *Heinr.* compares *Joseph. B. J. 2, 16, 4. Μαρτύρομαι δ' ἐγὼ ὑμῶν τὰ ἅγια, καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν πατρίδα τὴν κοινὴν*. The phrase *χωρὶς προκρίματος* signifies, without preference or partiality, *προσωποληψία*, respect of persons. The next words *μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλησιν* signify, “doing nothing through partiality.” Of the term *προσκ.*, and especially in its juridical application, *Wets.* adduces many examples.

22. *χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει*. It is strange that *Heinr.* should interpret this of laying on hands, in order to heal the sick, or of laying on hands, in order to absolve penitents, both equally inconsistent with the words following. Most Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed (*See Whitby*) that it applies to the ordination of Priests and Deacons; which *implies* an Episcopal authority and jurisdiction.

Ταχέως is well explained by *Theophyl.* *μὴ ἐκ πρώτης δοκιμασίας, μηδὲ ἐκ τρίτης, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις ἐξετάσας καὶ ακριβῶς*. The words following (as *Theodoret* observes) hint at the *danger*, *q. d.* “lest from being the *cause* of what is done, thou be partaker of his offences, and consequently of the punishment thence resulting.” The *σεαυτὸν ἄγνον τήξει* is, by some, referred to the former; *q. d.* “From such sins keep thyself free.” But this seems harsh. It is better, with the antients and several moderns, to regard it as an independent and general admonition, making *σεαυτὸν* emphatical, and understanding the *ἄγν.* of moral purity, especially chastity.

23. *μηκέτι ὑδροπότηι—ἀσθενείας.* This sentence is regarded by the best Commentators as parenthetical. Yet the Apostle would scarcely make so abrupt an insertion as many Commentators suppose. (See Benson and Paley ap. Valpy.) It should rather appear to be suspended on the *σεαυτὸν ἄγνον τήρει*; and the connection has (I think) been best seen by Crell. and Heinr.; q. d. “And in order thereto practise not the ascetic austerities so magnified by some; do not mortify the flesh, lest it be too weak to assist the spirit. No; drink no longer water.” By *ὑδροπ.* is meant, drink not water *only*; Anglicè, “be no longer a water-drinker.” Of this sense of the word Wets. adduces many examples. Ἄλλ’ ὀλίγω χρῶ, “but use a little wine (with it).” The Commentators, especially Wets., here adduce numerous Classical citations on the beneficial effect of wine drunk in moderation; which may be believed without those weighty vouchers. It is, however, rather a medical than a theological question; and as such I leave it. The Heathen Priests, we are *told*, either drank none, or but little.

It is observed by Benson, that there was no occasion for inspiration to give this counsel. But Mackn., with far more judgment, remarks that it was properly inserted in an inspired writing, because thereby the superstition of those who totally abstain from wine and all fermented liquors, on pretence of superior sanctity, is condemned.

24, 25. *τίνων ἀνθρώπων—κρίσιν.* There has been some difference of opinion as to the scope of this and the next verse. Some antients and moderns think it is to be taken, in a general way, of the *judgment of God*. Others refer it to the *ecclesiastical censures* before mentioned. Others, again, as Chrys. and the Greek Commentators (and indeed most eminent moderns), take it to relate solely to the *ordination* mentioned at ver. 22. This interpretation (which alone bears the stamp of truth) is well expressed by

Whitby. Rosenm. observes that *ἁμαρτίαι* signifies the *report* of the sins, as *πίστις* the report of faith, 1 Thess. 1, 8. On the sense of *προδηλ.* see the note on 2 Cor. 5, 11.

Theodoret well paraphrases thus: Οὐ πάντες προφανῶς ἁμαρτάνουσιν· εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ καὶ κρύβδην παρανομοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ὅμως τὸ σήμερον λανθάνον τῷ χρόνῳ φωράται· ἀνάμεινε τοίνυν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς πείρας διδασκαλίαν.

The obscurity with which this admonition is worded is similar to that often found in passages of Thucyd. or Tacitus. Nor is it unusual in the Rabbinical writers. Indeed it has ever been a characteristic of the Oriental style to express common thoughts in an uncommon way, rather than (like the Western sages) “to *think* with the wise, and speak with the foolish.”

CHAP. VI.

The directions in this and the following verse are (as appears from ver. 3.) intended to correct certain contrary positions of false teachers. These are supposed, by many eminent modern Commentators, to have been Judaizers, who wanted to introduce into the Christian Church the doctrine that, as no *Jew* was to remain a slave for life, so ought no *Christian*; thus releasing men from civil duties, under the pretence of religious rights, to the great scandal of the Gospel. (See Benson and Mackn.) This seems not improbable; and yet the notion may be carried too far. Into errors of this kind ignorant or unreflecting persons might easily fall, *without* the corruption of any judaizing doctrines, or the seductions of false teachers. It was easy to see that the *spirit* of the Gospel (which considers all men as equal) is adverse to slavery; and in proportion as its injunctions are obeyed, tends to root out a practice in which folly and injustice are alike conspicuous. It was natural

for persons ignorant and poor to believe what they wished, and to confound the spirit with the letter of the Gospel, and regard it as freeing men from all obligations inconsistent with justice and equity. The misunderstanding, too, of metaphors (such as “the liberty with which Christ hath made us free,”) would encourage this error. Be that as it may, the admonitions in question (especially as meant for a part of the world where slaves were exceedingly numerous) were highly seasonable.

VERSE 1. ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότης π. τ. ἀ. ἡ. The expression ὑπὸ ζυγὸν occurs in the Classical writers. Yet, perhaps, the Apostle puts the case in its strongest form, to more completely show the obligation to duty. By the δεσποτ. the Commentators say are meant Heathen masters. But it is rather used of all, whether Heathen or Christian. Ἰδίους has no emphasis; nor, indeed, much force. It may be rendered *respective*. Πάσης τιμῆς, “reverence and obedience of every kind, both in words, gestures, and deeds.” Π. τ. ἀξίους ἡγείσθωσαν is a refined expression for, “let them *show* all respect, &c. The ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία is treated, by Heinr., as an hendiadis for, “the glory of God to be promoted by the religion of Christ.” But the terms may better be considered separately. Βλασφημῆται, “censured and calumniated.” For the reasons above mentioned the Gospel might be misunderstood, and, therefore, abused by some, and calumniated by others. Compare 1 Pet., 2, 18.

2. μὴ καταφρονεῖτωσαν, scil. αὐτῶν, “let them not despise their orders, and refuse obedience.” Ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλεύετωσαν, “but let them serve them the more zealously.” Ὅτι πιστοὶ—ἀντιλαμβάνόμενοι. The sense of πιστοὶ and ἀγαπητοί is clear: both terms denoting *Christians*; the former, as regards *God*; the latter, *both God and each other*. But the sense of οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβάνόμενοι is somewhat obscure, and, from the extent of sense in the words, indeterminate. It may be understood either with

reference to the *masters*, i. e. those who receive the benefit (of their service), see Els., Benson, and Wets.); or to the *slaves*, i. e. those who apply themselves to benefit them. And so the antients, and many recent Commentators. There is some harshness connected with both interpretations; but the former (which is well detailed by Valpy and Slade) seems to be the more natural and agreeable to the context. It is required, too, by the *article*; and it is characteristic of the delicacy of the Apostle to term the service an *εὐεργ.*; just as a little before he calls the stipend paid to Ministers a *τιμὴ*.*

3. *εἴ τις ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖ*. On this term see the note supra, 1, 3., *καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται*, “and comes not to, hearkens not to, is not obedient to.” This signification is illustrated by Loesner, Kypke, and Munthe: and thus it appears that there was no occasion for Bentley to conjecture *προσέχεται*. The examples adduced by those Commentators remove the great Critic’s objection, that such a sense is unauthorized. The only harshness is, that the term would rather require a dative of the *person* than of the *thing*. But the Apostle little heeds such niceties; and probably this is a Cilicism, or provincial and idiotical expression.

Ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις is used as *ὕγ. διδασκαλία*, supra, 1, 10.; and of this expression Loesner adduces several examples from Philo. The *καὶ* is exegetical, and signifies *even*. The *τοῦ κυρίου* I. X. is best explained by Doddr. thus: “What the Apostle wrote,

* The sentence is elegantly paraphrased by Wets. thus: “Verum est, servos, qui Christo nomen dederunt, ad altiorem evehi dignitatem, et dominorum suorum fratres fieri: neque tamen ideo eos imperium detrectare, dominorumque jussa contemnere fas est; quin potius propter hoc ipsum magis servire debent, nam tum demum fidorum et dilectorum appellatione verè digni erunt, si curant, ut non tantum formidine pœnæ imperatâ faciant, sed ex amore erga dominos liberaliter ipsis serviant, suâ voluntate negotia domini gerant, deque illis bene mereri, atque adeo etiam beneficia in dominos conferre studeant.”

as by Divine direction, was, in effect, the *words* and commandments of Christ."

4. τετύφωται—λογομαχίας, "He is puffed with the inflation of ignorance; for nothing does he know as he ought," &c. See the note supra, 3, 6.* As to the reading of some MSS. τετύφλωται, it seems to be a *paradiorthosis*: though I have observed that the words are often interchanged; as in Phil. Jud., p. 1, & 335 D., besides numerous other passages illustrative of the two words, which I omit. The sense is, "he is puffed up with spiritual pride, though knowing nothing accurately." Compare Col. 2, 18. The verb τυφώω, from τύφος, *smoke*, has three senses; 1., *to smoke*, as used of *bees*; so Hesych.: τυφῶσαι, πνίξαι, ἀπύλεσαι. 2., *to blow up*, and, metaphorically, *to inflate, make vain*; as here, and in 2 Tim., 3, 4. 3., *to encircle with smoke*, thereby dimming the eyes, and, metaphorically, the understanding. So Alcæus frag. 8. Mus. Crit. 1, 426., πᾶμπαν δὲ τύφος ἐξέλετο φρένας.

4. νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας. The νοσῶν is used in conformity with ὑγαίνουσι λόγοις just before, and signifies, "having a diseased and morbid fondness for."† Bp. Wilkins would render: "sick of the wrangling disease," with which, Doddr. truly observes, the Christian Clergy, of all ages and nations, have been too generally infected.

By ζητήσεις, are meant subtle questions, mere *puzzles*, such as the Orientals have ever delighted in. Λογομαχίαι denotes, properly, contests about *words*. Some take it here to denote disputations on the λόγοι,

* Kypke compares Plut.: δι' ἀγνοίαν καὶ ἀπάτην τετυφωμένον' 2. 70., μαϊνκὸν καὶ ἀνόητον καὶ τετυφωμένον' 169., τετύφωται καὶ δαιμονῶσιν' and 330., ἀσφον καὶ τετυφωμένον. I add Dionys. Hal. 1, 381., τετύφωμαι' Polyb. 3, 8, 1., ἀγνοεῖ καὶ τετύφωται. Lucian 1, 755, 7. and 818, 91. Marc. Anton. 8, 25. Philostr. V. Ap. 7, 22., ἀγνοεῖ καὶ τετύφωται. See Imisch on Herodian 6, 5, 24.

† This sense of νοσεῖν is frequent in the Classical writers. See Wets., to whose examples I add Paus. 7, 10., οἱ ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ νοσησάντες' and Diog. ap. Athen. 104 c., Στοᾶς λογηρίων ἀναπεπλησμένος νοσεῖς.

or laws of Moses ; a sense of λόγος elsewhere occurring. But the signification above mentioned must not be excluded. The subjects of these disputations (if we may judge by the Rabbinical writings) were, no doubt, trifling enough, verbal discussions of the minutest sort, and an agitation of questions, useless and indeterminable. Would to Heaven that some Foreign Theologians of the new school could see how nearly they are copying these *έτεροδιδασκάλοι* ; so that the words of the Apostle as exactly describe *them* as any thing to be found in Theophrastus, does his originals. Truly is it remarked by Theophyl. : "Οπου οὐκ ἔστι πίστις, ἅπαντα νοσεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ μάχαι τίκτονται λόγων, τοῦ πιθανοτέρου τὸν ἕτερον ἀνατρέπειν δοκοῦντος. Ἡ πίστις ὀφθαλμός ἐστιν· ὁ μὲν ἔχων ὀφθαλμούς, οὐδὲν εὐρίσκει, ἀλλὰ μόνον ζητεῖ.

Φθόνος, ἔρις, and βλασφημίαι, require no explanation. The *ὕπόνοιαι πονηραὶ* may either signify *evil surmisings* and *malignant jealousies*, as the early moderns explain ; or (rather), as the antients and the moderns, *evil and false doctrines*, *δόγματα πονηρὰ*. And Grot. compares Sirach 3, 24. It is here truly and beautifully observed by Theodoret : Οἱ γὰρ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀφιστάμενοι, καὶ λογισμοῖς οἰκείοις ἐπόρμενοι, διδάσκειν μὲν πειρῶνται τὰ μὴ προσήχοντα, ἔρις δὲ καὶ φθόνος ἐντεῦθεν ἀκολουθεῖ, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐριδος ἡ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημία τολμᾶται· τῆς δὲ πίστεως ἐληλαμένης, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραὶ περιφύονται· ἐντεῦθεν δὲ λύμη τις γεννᾶται διαφθείρουσα τοὺς πελάζοντας. Rosenm. acknowledges that the whole history of heresies proves the truth of the Apostle's sayings. And yet the Heresiarchs themselves must have been well aware of the warning ; and, therefore, were without excuse. Heinr. thinks the words are applicable to *those times*, and not the present, "when we have learned greater liberality !" But human nature is the same in every age, and I fear the fruits of heresy have been as bitter in our own as in any former period.

5. Παραδιατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν. Παραδ. (which, as almost all Critics are agreed, should

be read for διαπαρατρ.) is explained, by Theophyl., σχολαὶ μάταιοι. The διὰ, Heinr. thinks, imports *vehemence*, and the παρὰ, *inanity*. The term seems to stand in the place of two words; διατρ., which is frequent, and παρατριβή, which is somewhat rare: though Wets. adduces examples; as Max. Tyr. D. 39, 3., πολλαὶ γὰρ αἱ παρατριβαὶ καὶ ἀπατηλαί, ὧν αἱ μὲν πολλαὶ ἐπὶ κρημνοῦς καὶ βάραθρα ἄγουσιν. The compounds διαπαρα and παραδια are almost equally rare. Here I would compare a similar sentiment of Plut. 2, 999., λόγων ἐξήλουν σχολὴν καὶ διατρίβας ἀπράκτους.

5. ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας. This must mean, who have deprived themselves of the truth (as found in the Gospel), are devoid of it. And Heinr. compares ἀστόχειν τῆς ἀληθείας at 1, 6., and ναυαγεῖν περὶ τὴν πίστιν, 1, 19.; observing, that the *cause* why they are so is, that they sacrifice religion to lucre.*

5. νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσεβείαν. The best Commentators interpret this, “thinking and regarding religion, the Christian as well as any other, a thing valuable only as it is subservient to lucre and interest.” See Grot., Crell., Benson, Dodd., &c. It is strange that so many should have rendered it, “supposing that gain is godliness.” For though the construction equally permits this, and it may be justified in a loose paraphrase, it is not so apposite. Indeed, as Abp. Newcome observes, the article shows that εὐσέβεια is the *subject*, not the *predicate*. Of passages of this structure Wets. adduces as examples Dionys. Hal. 3, 5., οἱ δὲ χρηματισμὸν ἡγούμενοι τὸν πόλεμον. Seneca, Ep. 108., qui philosophiam velut aliquod artificium venale didicerunt. See also Liv. 4, 30. To which I add the following still more apposite ones. Zosin. 2, 38, 2., τὴν

* So Theophyl. remarks “that the λογομάχοι draw more disciples, from whom they derive profit; and hence cultivate the λογομαχία the more, that they may draw over the more.” This, I would observe, affords no bad clue to the origin and maintenance of *Sectarism*.

γὰρ ἀσωτίαν ἡγεῖτο φιλοτιμίαν Joseph 1108, 19., ἀρετὴν ἡγούμενος τὴν ἀπάτην Apollon. Epist. 35., πλὴν εἰ μὴ τῶν ἀνοήτων λόγῳ, παρ' οἷς καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος ἀρετὴ.

Ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τοιούτων. It is strange that so many Critics should wish to cancel these words, because they are omitted in some six MSS., the Vulg. and Copt. No good reason can be assigned for their *insertion*; whereas their *omission* is easily accounted for, namely, from accidental error, which could not easily be afterwards discovered, as they are not necessary to the context. Pricæus compares many similar passages of the Classical writers; and Schleus. compares Sirach 7, 2., ἀπόστηθι ἀπὸ ἀδίκου. The Greek Commentators well explain: "do not dispute with them; for, until their disease of avarice be cured, no good can be hoped for."

6. ἔστι δὲ πορισμὸς μέγα ἢ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας. The Apostle, skilfully (per antanaclasin et epanorthosin), gives such a turn to the phrase as may serve to impress a lesson on Timothy, never to be forgotten by any Minister of the Gospel. So Chrys. and Theophyl.: ἔστι τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ πορισμὸς, οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι οἴονται, ἀλλὰ μειζόνως· οὐχ ὅταν χρήματα ἔχῃ ἀλλ' ὅταν μὴ ἔχῃ. Heinr. here, as often, shoots beyond the mark, and misses the truth, which lies *ante pedes*, by seeking it *in nubibus*. The common interpretation is undoubtedly the true one. Πορισμὸς, signifies, what produces great gain. I would compare Æschyl. P. V. 3., μέγας πόρος. See the note on Phil. 3, 7.* The sense is: "Religion, if accompanied with that contented spirit which it imparts, produces the greatest gain, even the greatest happiness."

7. οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν—δυνάμεθα. The γὰρ has reference to a clause omitted; q. d. "Why should we be so anxious to secure what can stand us in so

* Among many other passages Wets. here compares Cic. Parad. 6., Scil. It. 1, 615., Philo. 2, 582, 5., τί ἂν εἴη κέρδος λυσιτελέστερον ὁσιότητος; Diod. Sic. 594., Epicurus ap. Clem. Alex. 751., Hor. Carm. 4, 9, 15.

little stead, and fail us so soon. *For* there is nothing we can long enjoy." A reason for abandoning all excessive anxiety about gaining wealth obvious to natural reason, and which had been often enlarged on (though to little purpose) by the philosophers.*

8. ἔχοντες δὲ διατροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα, τούτοις ἀρκεσθυσόμεθα, "Having then food and raiment, let us be therewith content." Here, Theophyl. remarks, the Apostle shews in what this αὐταρκεία consists.

Διατροφ. is a somewhat rare word, especially in the *plural*. One should rather have expected the singular (which is indeed found in some MSS., but ex emendatione). Perhaps it was so put to answer to σκεπάσματα, which is also rare in the *plural*, and may be compared with our *clothes*.† Commentators have not seen that the διὰ in-διατρ. imports *certainly*, i. e. a perpetual supply of necessary food. Kypke observes, that σκεπ. includes the *shelter of a house*. And this might be confirmed and illustrated from Artemid. 4, 30., where Reif refers to G. Wakef. S. C. 3, 147. But it is probable that this was a proverbial phrase; and as house-room is the least of the wants of man in the East, so it is not mentioned. On the *sentiment* see Grot. and Wolf. Wets. adduces several Classical passages, to which I add Eurip. Phœn. 564. Hec. 321. Incert. frag. 14. and 163. and Æschin. p. 85, 6. ἀρκεῖ μοι μικρὰ, καὶ μειζόνων αἰσχροῦς οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ. See also D. Cass. 18, 67. Herodian 4, 7, 9. Diod. Sic. 3, 28. Hebr. 13, 5.

* Wets. cites Hor. Carm. 2, 14, 21., Propert. 3, 3., Ovid. T. 5, 14, 12., Sil. It. 5, 26., &c. See also Grot. and Pric. Heinr. (from Loesner) cites Philo, 852 c. Μηδὲν εἰς κόσμον, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ σαντὸν εἰσηνεγκας· γυμνὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦλθες, γυμνὸς πάλιν ἀπίης· where there seems reference to Job 1, 21., Eccles. 5, 15. See also Ps. 49, 11. To the above I add Soph. Antig. 1037., and Eurip. Ion. 648.

† This is considered as a plural; though it is probably one of those numerous nouns derived from the third person singular present indicative: on which see H. Tooke in his Ἑπεὶ Πτερ.

9. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν ἐπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμον καὶ παγίδα.

Heinr. here remarks : " Quæ jam de avaritiâ et amore scelerato habendi sequuntur, neutiquam urgenda nimis aut premenda, sed cogitandum, apud Judæos idolatriam et avaritiam fuisse in summo crimine habita." And again : " Populariter ergo, ut aiunt, hæc intelligenda." But surely the learned Theologian never more manifestly perverted the truth than here. It is one of the most prominent characteristics of the Gospel, that it so severely condemns a vice which has produced more crime and more misery, (with less temptation to plead), than any other ! It is in vain, too, that Heinr. attempts to dilute the strong sense of the Apostle, in this finely conceived and well expressed passage which follows. And it is in vain that he attempts to sink it into Jewish notions by the following Rabbinical passage (cited by Schoettg. H. Hebr.) Cùm Salomon ædificasset templum, stetit in precibus suis et dixit : Domine totius mundi, si homo a te divitias petet in hac domo, tu vero scias quòd periturus sit in divitiis suis. Avarice and idolatry are indeed compared, both in the Old and new Testament ; not that they are of equal enormity, but in order to show the great guilt of the former. Surely had not avarice been a great crime, our Lord would never have used the strong language he so often did : nor would St. Paul have expressed himself as he has done here, and elsewhere. So at ver. 17. he anxiously resumes the subject, and earnestly enjoins Timothy to " charge them that are rich μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, &c.

This, however, is a subject too extensive to be thus treated in *transcurso* ; and, to turn to the passage before us, οἱ βουλόμενοι π. is rendered, " qui ditescere cupiunt," who would be rich. But the sense may be better expressed thus, " who study to be rich, and direct their thoughts and cares to its attainment." Thus it will include those already rich ; since they usually aim at more. The εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ παγίδα are considered as an hendiadis for εἰς πειρασμοῦ παγίδα. But the terms are better kept separate ; and we must subaud τοῦ διαβόλου (which is supplied in some very antient MSS.), or τοῦ πονηροῦ. On these words the philological Commentators adduce nothing. The following citation may therefore be acceptable. Thucyd. 3, 45. ἡ δ' ἐξουσία ὕβρει τὴν πλεονεξίαν καὶ φρονήματι αἱ δ' ἄλλαι ξυντυχίαι ὀργῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἐκάστη τις κατέχεται ὑπ' ἀνηκεστὸν τινὸς κρείττονος, ἐξάγουσιν ἐς τοὺς κινδύνους.

The words following are exegetical of the preceding, and exemplify the effects of the temptation. They fall, the Apostle says, εἰς ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβεράς. The ἀνοήτ. is applicable to foolish kinds of expence which the rich and luxurious run into : on which see Chrys. and Theophyl. It is, however, also applied to the affections and passions, and especially in carnal gratification.*

* I would compare Pausan. 8, 24, 4. The τὸ μῶρον and ἡ μωρία, are especially used by the Greek dramatists of ἀκολασία ; as

All these particulars may be included ; and such things are indeed *ἀνόητα*, because (as Mack. says) they are unworthy the dignity of human nature. That they are *βλαβερά*, *hurtful* even to the *person himself*, is equally certain ; always *tending* to disease, and ever cheating the wretch with the shadow, but never giving him the substance of happiness is certain, thus turning out to be, in the words of Scripture “ vain things which *cannot* profit, because they are vain.”

The metaphor in *βυθίζουσιν*—*ἀπώλειαν*, is taken from plunging any one into a deep abyss from which he can never rise, and is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. See Wets., the most apposite of whose citations is Longin. S. 44. ἡ γὰρ φιλοχρηματία, πρὸς ἣν ἅπαντες ἀπλήστως ἤδη νοσοῦμεν, καὶ ἡ φιληδονία δουλαγωγοῦσι, μᾶλλον δὲ ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, καταβυθίζουσι αὐτάνδρους ἤδη τοὺς βιούς. So also Apulej. cited (after Pric.) by Rosenm.

10. *ρίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία*. A sentiment very common in the Classical writers. See Wets.* Theodoret observes : καὶ γὰρ μισοφρονεῖν, καὶ γοητεῖν, καὶ ἀρπαγαὶ καὶ πλεονεξίαι, καὶ ψῆδος, καὶ παράβασις ὄρκων, καὶ τᾶλλα τῆς παρανομίας εἶδη, ἐκ τῆς *ρίζης ταύτης βλαστάνει*.

10. καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις πολλαῖς. A very lively and forcible image, in the explanation of which, however, many critics, as Leigh, Doddr., Mackn., and others, who render it, “ stabbed themselves from head to foot,” are greatly mistaken. The *περὶ* is here put for *ἐπὶ*, or *ἐν*, *upon*. Wets. adduces many examples both of the physical sense, by which the term signifies to stick any thing through, or stick any thing upon, as a piece of meat on a fork ; and of the metaphorical, as *περίπ. ὀδύνῃ*, which occurs in Hom. Il. ε. 399. &c. Among many other passages which I could here cite, I will only adduce a shrewd remark of Æsop F. σς’ ἀδεκάστως πράγμα προσιόντες λανθάνουσιν ἑαυτοὺς περιπείροντες ἀτόπιστοις.

How this *ὀδύνῃ* arises, it is needless to explain.

Eurip. Hipp. 972. Troad 1059. Dictys. frag. 1. Suid. *ἀνόητα*, ἀφροδίσια. And so Goldsmith : “ When lovely woman stoops to folly.”

* To whose examples I add Theogn. Sentent. 389. seqq. 904. seqq. Phocyl. 13, 37. Aristoph. Ao. 158 A. δεῖ ζῆν ἀνευ βαλαντίου, where see Timocreon. Eurip. Incert. frag. 155. ὦ Ζεὺς—πέμψον μὲν φῶς ψυχᾶς, ἀνέρων τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀθλόους προμαθεῖν πόθεν ἐβλαστον, τις *ρίζα κακῶν*.

11. σὺ δὲ—*πράοτητα*. The term *ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ* properly denotes a *servant of God*; as Ps. 90, 11.; or a *divine legate*, who makes known the will of God to men; a title frequently applied in the Old Testament to Prophets, as Elijah. And this seems to be the sense here; for elsewhere the Apostle says, "So then we are ambassadors for Christ's sake."

11. *δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην*, "pursue studiously." I would compare Eurip. Ion 440. *δίωκε ἀρετὰς*. With the following list of the principal Christian duties; compare Gal. 5, 22. The *δικαιοσύνη* signifies righteousness towards men; *εὐσεβεία*, piety towards God, *godliness*. *Πίστιν* is explained by many recent Commentators *fidelity*. But the common interpretation, a *true faith*, a *firm unshaken faith*, is equally well founded. The other terms require no explanation.

12. *ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως*. Many Commentators, especially the recent ones, understand this of maintaining the good cause of religion. (See Heinr. and Rosenm.) But that seems too limited an interpretation, and arose from a misconception of the scope of the passage, which is well pointed out by Crell. thus: "Occasione superioris admonitionis in generalem *παραίνεσιν* effunditur, quâ illum quodam quasi vocis suæ classico ad strenuè officii sui munera obeunda excitat, quasi dicat. Et ut rem in pauca conferam, et in quo omnes conatus ac industriam tuam consumi et occupari volo semel aperiam." This must regard all his exertions as a Christian and a minister, whether in the defence of the faith, or in the propagation and illustration of it, both by his words and action.

The *ἀγών* is called *καλ.* or *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *honourable*, as compared with the ignoble objects which called forth the exertions of the *ἀγωνισταί*. The agonistic allusion is especially observable in *ἐπιλαβοῦ*, which hints at the eagerness with which the competitors strove to seize the prize. Of course it must signify *endeavour*, *strive*, lay hold of. Many verbs are to be so explained; on which see Glass Phil. Sacr.

Rosenm., by rendering it *obtain*, lets all the spirit of the metaphor evaporate.

Εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης, i. e. not, “*art* called,” but “*wert* called,” namely, at his conversion and baptism. So Œcumen. The next words καὶ ὁμολόγησας—μαρτύρων, some take as exegetical of the preceding. Thus Heinr. takes καὶ for καὶ γὰρ. But it should seem that these words refer to the *profession* and *vow* which accompanied ordination to his ministerial office. Now the ὁμολογία was κάλη, because it contained a full profession of faith and hope, and a solemn engagement to live wholly for the dissemination of the Christian religion. To these engagements Timothy’s fortitude and courage in defending, and zealous diligence in propagating the faith, well corresponded.

The *witnesses* are said by Commentators to have been the *Presbyters*. But as πολλῶν is added, it should seem that the congregation at large, who were probably admitted on such occasions, may be understood; and from the great expectations formed of so very promising a youth (see 1 Tim. 1, 18. and the note), there would be a considerable number.

13. παρὰγγέλλω—ὁμολογίαν. What the Apostle had so far propounded by figure, he now expresses in the natural way. For he does not, I think, commence a *new* subject, but continues the same that he had before been treating of. How tender was the affection the Apostle bore to Timothy, is evident from this solemn charge, which comes from the very heart. The same warmth of feeling is observable in c. 5, 21. and 2 Tim. 4, 1. By such exhortation he endeavours to instil into Timothy a constancy to be shaken by no tribulations, not even death itself. (Heinr.)

The ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, hints that God is a witness of this solemn charge. By πάντα are meant all living creatures: and it is hinted that God who giveth life, and preserveth it, can replace the life sacrificed for the Gospel’s sake by a far more glorious one.

Ἐπὶ, *sub, coram*. The ὁμολογ. refers to the *admission* of our Lord, that he was King of the Jews and the Son of God, Matt. 27, 11. Mark 15, 2. Joh. 18, 37. The τὴν, which is not attended to by the Commentators, seems to indicate that it was *well known*; and thus supplies another proof that St. Paul was acquainted with the three first Gospels when he wrote his later Epistles, and with that of St. Matthew (at least in the Hebrew edition) when he wrote his earlier ones. One may observe in μαρτυρ. ομ. a blending of the two phrases; for though μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν may be used, and ὁμολογίαν ὁμολογεῖν, yet never (I think) μαρτυρίαν ὁμολογεῖν. So Theophyl.: τοῦτο καὶ πολλὰ ἑτέρα ἐμαρτύρησε, καὶ ὁμολόγησε. I agree with Doddr. that this is called καλὴν, as being that on the truth of which all our hopes of salvation are founded. And so we sometimes use the epithet *glorious*.

14. τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἄσπιλον, &c. Most recent Commentators, as Heinr. and Rosenm., take the ἐντολὴν to mean the Christian doctrine, the Christian religion. But the proofs they adduce are very weak; and it is not a little harsh to apply the epithets ἄσπιλος and ἀνεπίληπτος to *doctrine* or *religion*, which Rosenm. admits, are always elsewhere used of the *life* and *conduct*. I see no reason to abandon the common and natural interpretation of ἐντολὴ, namely, *commandment*; though the epithets here used are as little applicable to *commandment* as to *doctrine*. There is, however, no necessity for construing them with the ἐντολὴν. They may be taken apart, and referred to σε. The construction is: (ὥστε σε εἶναι) ἄσπιλον. And so Beza, Crell., Est., and Heinr. This, too, is supported by the antients. So Theoph.: τουτέστι, μήτε δογμάτων ἕνεκεν, μήτε βίου, κηλὶδα τινὰ ἑαυτῷ προστριβόμενον. The ἐντολὴ may be understood of the whole body of injunctions above given; but especially that comprehensive one just before “to fight the good fight of faith;” for with this the τὴν ἐντολὴν is closely connected; the words εἰς ἣν—μαρτύ-

ρων being, in some measure, parenthetical. So that τὴν ἐντολὴν should be rendered *this* commandment or injunction, and a comma should be placed after ἐντολὴν.

It is strange that from the words μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τ. κ. &c. some, as Grot. and Rosenm., should have inferred that the Apostle thought Timothy might live till the day of judgment. Surely if the Apostle meant any thing of that sort, the words must imply *certainty* rather than *doubt*. Now St. Paul could not know *that* but from *revelation*, and that he could have received none, we know from the *event*: indeed this is clear from the words following. That the Apostle had no such opinion of the very speedy advent of Christ, has been shown before. See 2 Thess. 2, 1 and 2. What, then, is the sense to be assigned to the ἐπιφανεῖα? Heinr. after a tedious minute discussion of the passage, renders: “usque ad illud tempus, quâ constantia tua et virtus præmiis a J. C. afflicietur dignissimis.” But this is too harsh. I confess I see no interpretation so probable as that of the antients and early moderns, and recently Slade, who take this to signify his *death*; since that event is to every one *as* the coming of the Lord. This idiom often occurs in the New Testament; and, as Theophyl. observes, it is here used as being more impressive than μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς σου. The same interpretation is adopted by Crell., who has, I think, better illustrated the sense of the passage than any other Commentator antient or modern.

15. Now are accumulated the most splendid predicates of the majesty and power of God; and these pave the way for the doxology which closes the passage. (Heinr.)

15. καιροῖς ἰδίοις, “at his own time, that which seems good to himself.” Thus it is hinted that this is unknown to men. Heinr. thinks the words are intended to quiet the trepidation of some who thought the advent of the Messiah was at hand. Δείξει, *procurabit*.

Of the terms of this glorious doxology, μακάριος has been treated of at 1, 11. Rosenm. compares a passage of Philo, where God is said to be μακαριωτάτος καὶ πάσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀνάπλεως. The δυνάστης (as used of the Deus Opt. Max.) is well rendered *potentate*. The term is so applied in 2 Macc. 3, 24. πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης, and 12, 15. ὁ μέγας τοῦ κόσμου δυνάστης, and 15, 23. δυν. τῶν οὐρανῶν. Μόνος is used as in Rom. 16, 27. μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, and Jud. 25. 1 Cor. 9, 6. 14, 36. and elsewhere. The word is, indeed, applied to all the attributes of the Deity, to show that he is so transcendently the possessor of them, that he alone may be said to possess them.

15. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων, καὶ Κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων. The Commentators adduce several similar expressions from the Classical writers; as Hor. Carm. 3, 1, 5. Æschyl. Pers. 24. βασιλῆς, βασιλέως ὑποχοι μεγάλου. Hesych. ὑπατε κρειόνων, βασιλεὺς βασιλευόντων. Philo 2, 187, 5. βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων καὶ θεὸς θεῶν. Valerius Soranus Regum rex ipse Deusque. Diodor. 1, 55. βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ δεσπότης δεσποτῶν Σεσώωσις. It seems to have been an epithet first applied by the piety of the earlier ages to the Supreme Governor of the universe, but afterwards usurped by the pride of earthly monarchs, or ascribed to them by base adulation. So that in the times of the later Greek historians it was regularly claimed by or attributed to the Roman emperors and Persian monarchs.

16. ὁ μόνος ἔχον ἀθανασίαν, i. e. immortality *self-derived*; by which it is implied that he alone can confer it. So Joh. 5, 26. "hath life in himself." Φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον. It is observed by Heinr. that almost all the antients assigned to their God an habitation in light so dazzling as to be unapproachable to human eyes. Thus Hom. Od. ξ. 42. and η. 84, cited by Wets., who adds from Plut. 1, 173, οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν μὲν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς θεοὺς κατοικεῖν λέγουσι, ἀσφαλὲς ἔδος καὶ ἀσάλευτον καλοῦντες, οὐ πνεύμασιν, οὐ νέφεσιν χρωμένον, ἀλλ' αἰθρία μαλακῇ καὶ φωτὶ καθαροῷ τὸν

ἅπαντα χρόνον ὁμαλῶς περιλαμπόμενον. See also Ezech. 8, 2. and the Targum, cited by Wets. Yet it may perhaps be better to understand it metaphorically, as expressive of the invisible nature of God, whose ways are past finding out; as Job. 11, 7. “canst thou by seeking find out God.” It were easy to say much more; and the Commentators, especially Heinr., are not wanting in curious speculations: but upon so awful a subject I forbear.

17. τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι παράγγελλε μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν. From his anxiety with respect to a class of whose salvation our Lord has strongly expressed the difficulties, the Apostle adds this earnest injunction.

By the πλουσ. ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι the Commentators are agreed is meant, those who possess the riches of *this* world, as opposed to the *spiritual riches* mentioned at Matt. 6, 20. 19, 21. Mark 10, 21. Luke 12, 21 and 23. 18, 22. 2 Cor. 8, 9. James 2, 5. Ap. 2, 9. Wets. produces similar expressions from the Rabbins. Μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, not to be puffed up, carry themselves haughtily, be, as we familiarly say, *purse-proud*. See the note on Rom. 2, 20. Schleus. refers to R. de Prado in Pentecont. p. 20., a learned, but very rare, book. How prone the rich have been in every age to this vice, the records of history and antiquity amply testify: but this may be so easily imagined that the Commentators might have spared the immense farrago with which they here overwhelm us. It is such learned lumber as this that makes our shelves groan under something of *less* value than what Gibbon calls “the weight of *Benedictine Fathers*.”

It is plain that πλούτου ἀδηλόγητι is for ἀδήλῳ πλούτῳ. How applicable this is to riches (which, as Horace says, “Puncto mobilis horæ Permutat Dominos, et cedit in altera jura”), is obvious. See 11, 44. 1 Cor. 9, 26. 2 Macc. 7, 34. I would compare Phocyl. frag. 13, 24. ὁ βίος τρόχος, ἄστατος ὄλβος, and Eurip. Electr. 940—44.

Ἄλλ' ἐν τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ. An epithet often applied to God, and here especially apposite: for, as Rosenm. observes, riches are things inanimate; God a Being having life, and the cause of life. Besides, as Heinr. remarks, *life* suggests an idea of *constancy* and *immutability*. Compare James 1, 17. Ps. 102, 26, seq.

17. τῷ παρέχοντι, “who confers.”

17. πλουσίως, *abundantly*. Εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν. This term imports not only *tolerare vitam*, but an *enjoyment* of existence, at least as far as innocence extends, and *beyond* that he has provided that there should be no real enjoyment. See Acts 14, 7. The argument is, that as God is so bountiful as to satisfy all our wants, and to *some* (as the rich) supplies these blessings πλουσίως, he expects that the rich should imitate his beneficence by liberally imparting thereof to their fellow-creatures.

18. ἀγαθοεργεῖν, it is evident from the context, must signify to *confer benefits*. And in the use of the πλουσίοις, πλουσίως, and πλουτεῖν, there is a happy paronomasia. For πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς signifies, to liberally dispense their riches. The words following εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς are exegetical of the preceding. Εὐμεταδιδότος εἶναι signifies literally to *be good at distributing*. So Marc. Ant. 1, 14. (cited by Rosenm.) τὸ εὐμεταδιδότῳ καὶ εὐποιητικόν. Wets. adduces an example of ἀγαθοεργία from Etym. Mag. But he might have given a *Classical* authority; for I find the word in Procop. de Œdif. p. 36. On the *senti-ment* I would compare Liban. Orat. 839 B. αὐτομάτοι πρὸς εὐποίαν οἱ Θεοί, and Plato de Repub. 696 B. οἱ τῷ ὄντι πλουσίοι, οὐ χρυσίου, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν εὐδαίμονα πλουτεῖν, ζωῆς ἀγαθῆς.

The Commentators enlarge still further. But all seems too obvious to need much explanation: for as to understanding κοιν. of *affability*, as do some antients and moderns, that is destitute of all authority.

19. ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοὺς θεμέλιον καλὸν ε. τ. μ. There is here somewhat of harshness (at which the

Commentators stumble) arising from a blending of two metaphors, and a catachresis, by which ἀποθησ. is put for καταβαλλ. This, however, is not so unfrequent with the Apostle as to give any countenance to the critical conjectures of Bos, Le Clerc, Petit, Wakef., and others. Now in such a case the best mode of clearing the sense is, to consider the metaphors separately. Ἀποθησ. is very applicable to the preceding; q. d. “let them treasure up *durable* riches.” The θεμέλιον will mean, “for these will supply a good *ground* for expecting future happiness.” Theophyl. (from Chrys.) well remarks: ὅπου θεμέλιον, ἐκεῖ πάντα βέβαια καὶ ἀκίνητα· ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ τὰ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ἐδραῖα, διὰ τοῦτο θεμέλιον ἐμνήσθη.

The εἰς τὸ μέλλον, Heinr. observes, is opposed to the ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι at ver. 17. And he compares Matt. 6, 20. There is a similar sentiment in Tob. 4, 9 and 10.; from which some would here read θέμα. But the Apostle may have had that passage in mind without exactly following the very expressions.

The next words suggest the *result* or *tendency* of this ἀγαθοεργία, ἵνα ἐπιλαβ. τ. α. 3.; for such, I conceive, is the sense of the ἵνα. Charity to the poor can only *tend*, together with other good works, to gain us acceptance and salvation, through grace; and this force the ἵνα well expresses. I mention this, since the passage is perverted by the Popish Commentators to countenance their notion, that charity to the poor can procure, nay, *purchase* salvation. The reading τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς, which some eminent Commentators prefer, is evidently a *paradiorthosis*, or arose from a scholium. Whether in ἐπιλάβονται there be (as Slade thinks) a *third* and *agonistical* figure in addition to the two former, is doubtful.

20. The warm-hearted and affectionate disposition of the Apostle again appears in his concluding the Epistle with *another* (as it were), apostrophe, and earnest charge (as at 17.) to avoid what he knew

circumstances would often bring him in the way of encountering (for there is here a repetition of the charge at 4, 7).

20. τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον, “preserve the deposit committed to thee (by me).” The best Commentators are agreed that παρακαταθήκη signifies the doctrine of the Gospel committed to him by Paul. Which may be true, but seems not to be the *whole* truth. It may also mean the χάρισμα committed to him by the laying on of hands at ordination (as supra 4, 14.);* for of this the recipients are said in Scripture to be *stewards*. Compare 1 Cor. 4, 1. There may be an *allusion* (but there is no more) to the sacredness with which deposits were preserved by the antients.

20. ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας, “shunning, avoiding profane vanities and triflings,” i. e. (as the Commentators explain) the ματαιλογία, supra 1, 6. (and thus Suid. explains κενοφωνίας by ματαιοφωνίας); or rather, as Grot. says, the τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραωδεῖς μύθους at 4, 7.; for this is no other than a repetition of the charge there (where see the note). The ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδ. γνώσεως here, however, throws further light on the sense. In ἀντιθ. are hinted at the *altercations* and oppositions which this false knowledge was sure to engender. So ἐναντιωσ. is used by Philostr. V. Soph. 1, 25, 9. Rosenm. observes that here the *things* are put for the *persons*; and such Timothy was to avoid. But *both* seem to be meant; and there was probably some proneness in Timothy to this kind of ψευδ. γνώσ., which rendered it necessary for the Apostle to caution him to avoid it, and the professors of it. *Who* these were we are left to conjecture: but Tittmann de Vestig.

* Which interpretation, I find, is supported by the authority of Zonar. Lex. 1510., who explains it (as it should seem) from the antient Fathers) τὴν χάριν τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος ἣν διὰ τῆς χειροτονίας ἐδέξατο. He also notices another interpretation, namely, that of Theophyl., the *commands* of Paul to Timothy. But that is far less suitable to the sense of παρακ. and to the context.

Gnost. Opusc. Theolog. p. 25. seems satisfactorily to have shown that it could *not* be the *Gnostics*, whom Hamm. and others here recognize. There is no doubt but that the persons in question were Judaizers, perhaps formerly of the Essenes, who, on having become Christians, and perhaps Christian teachers, still hankered after their old dogmas. See Benson's note on Col. 2, 8, 16. et seqq.

21. *ἧν τινες—ἡστούχησαν*, "which (false knowledge) some who profess, err concerning the faith," i. e. the true Christian faith, as opposed to Jewish admixtures. On *ἡστ.* see the note on 1, 6. The construction *περὶ* after *ἄστ.* is irregular: but the *sense*, rather than the metaphor, is kept in view. *Ἡ χάρις*, *grace*, i. e. the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ. A very usual mode with St. Paul of commencing his Epistles. But in the words κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ, Ἰησοῦ this introductory salutation differs from the rest, and on its sense Commentators are not agreed. Some take it for σὺν ἐπαγγ. ζωῆς, "to whom is a promise of life." But that is too harsh. Benson renders the κατὰ *in respect to*. I prefer *in order to*; for I think, with Heinr., that it indicates the *end* and tendency of his Apostleship. The ζωῆς (which signifies eternal life), Benson thinks is levelled at the *Jews*; and the ἐν Ἰ. X., at the *Judaizers*. But such fancied allusions are often vain and hypothetical; and in an introductory salutation of this kind it were unreasonable to suppose them.

On ver. 2. see the note on 1 Tim. 1, 2.

3. χάριν ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ—ἡμέρας. The χάριν ἔχω signifies, "I thank God on your account." See 1 Thess. 1, 2. and 2 Thess. 1, 3. Ὡς λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐ. κ. σ. The ἀπὸ προγόνων is, by Schleus., considered as synonymous with ἐκ παιδός. But the common interpretation, *from my forefathers*, i. e. after them and by their example, seems to deserve the preference. Others may be seen in the Commentators. This is supposed to be levelled against the *Jews*, who accused him of abandoning the God

of his fore-fathers. He therefore hints that there is the same God worshipped under both covenants.

3. ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. The scope of this phrase is not very clear, and therefore has been variously explained. If λατρεύω signifies (as I think it here must), “whom I serve and have served,” the καθ. συν. must have a reference to his state before he was converted to the Christian faith; and probably this may be an indirect denial of the charge made against him by the Jews, that he had never acted from conscientious motives, either before or since his conversion. He means to say that he had always acted uprightly and conscientiously; though, before his conversion, erroneously. Such is the view of the sense taken by the antients* and, of the moderns, Whitby, Benson, and others. And it seems the best founded. They aptly compare Acts 22, 3. & 23, 1. “I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day.” See more in Whitby. Benson and Mackn. think he meant to reflect on the Judaizers, as having themselves put away conscience as well as faith. But this is uncertain.

3. ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν περὶ σου μνείαν ἐ. τ. δ., “How unceasingly I make mention of thee in my prayers.” Heinr. puts ὡς ἀδιαλ.—πληρωθῶ in a parenthesis; and he would take ὡς in the sense of *siquidem*, and as synonymous with ὅτι. Rosenm. interprets, “that I have good reason for making mention,” &c. And he remarks that verbs of action are often taken of what *ought* to be. Upon the whole, the *sense* is tolerably clear, though the phraseology and construction may be perplexed: and there is nothing in the common interpretation that need offend, if the words be not unduly pressed upon.

3. νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, “at all the regular returns of prayer, or, as often as, whenever I offer up my prayers.”

* Thus Theophyl.: Μὴ ὑποπτεύσης με ἄλλα φρονεῖν καὶ ἄλλα λέγειν· καθαρὸν μοί ἐστι τὸ συνειδὸς, ὥσπερ ἄει, καὶ νῦν· οὐ ψεύδομαι τοίνυν λέγων ὅτι φιλῶ σε, καὶ ἄει μεμνημαί σου.

4. μεμνημένος σου τῶν δακρύων, “being mindful of thy tears,” namely (as most Commentators think) at parting with Paul. See Acts 20, 37. It is rightly observed by Theophyl., that these words are parenthetical; and that ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν and ἵνα χαρὰς πληρωθῶ are connected.

5. ὑπόμνησιν λαμβάνων τῆς ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, for ὑπομνησκόμενοι. An uncommon, and perhaps provincial mode of expression. Ἀνυποκρ. πιστ., “sincere and unfeigned faith.” Ἐνώκησε ἐν, *inhæsit*. “So said (observes Est.), to signify the *stability* of it.” But there may be an allusion to the *spiritual grace* which accompanied and produced it. So Col. 3, 16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν. Or ἐνοικ. may here be simply for ἐνειμι. The καὶ, as corresponding to πρῶτον, may be rendered *deinde autem*. Μάμμη, *grandmother*. A term censured by the Greek Grammarians, but *used* by good authors. See Wets. On the var. lect. εὐνίκη I would refer to the Commentators on Theocr. Id. 20, 1.

At ὅτι must be repeated, not ἐνόκησε, but ἐνοικεῖ and ἐνοικήσει, “doth and will dwell.” This accommodation of a verb is frequent.

6. δι’ ἣν—χειρῶν μου, “For which reason (namely, that it may continue to dwell), I remind and exhort thee,” &c. Ἀναζωπυρεῖν signifies, properly, to stir up, blow up, as it were, *keep alive* a dull fire; and hence, metaphorically, to *rouse sluggishness*, and call into action any dormant faculty, whether of body or mind. See Wetstein’s examples.

Now he was to stir up and call into action the τὸ χάρισμα—χειρῶν. This χάρισμα is taken by many Commentators (as Rosenm. and Heinr.), to mean no more than *fortitude, courage, παρρησία*; for Timothy, they observe, seems to have been of a timid disposition, and to have needed an impulse and excitement from a more powerful mind. Which may be true; but the interpretation seems a needless and unwarrantable refinement. The antient Commentators, and the earlier moderns, have rightly seen

that it must mean the *supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit*, imparted by Paul at his ordination, in order to fit him for his office ; though I must doubt whether it includes a power of *working miracles*, which seems to have been confined to the *Apostles*. This χάρισμα, then, he was to rouse to renewed vigour and activity. For, as Theophyl. observes, ὥσπερ τὸ πῦρ δεῖται ξύλων, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Πνεύματος δεῖται προθυμίας, καὶ προσοχῆς, καὶ νήψεως, ἵνα αἰεὶ ἀναξέῃ· ὡς ἐὰν μὴ ταῦτα παρῶσι, σβέννυται, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχού λέγει· Τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. So Theodoret : καθάπερ τὸ ἔλαιον τῆς λαμπάδος τὴν φλόγα σφοδροτεραν ἐργάζεται, οὕτως ἡ καλὴ τῆς ψυχῆς προθυμία τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος τὴν χάριν ἐφέλκεται.

This sense of ἀναμιμνήσκειν, by which it signifies to *remind*, *admonish*, is very rare. The term seems to have been here used from delicacy, since it is not so strong a one as παρακαλέω. In such a case the Classical writers unite παρακαλεῖν with it. An example from Plut. 2, 33. is adduced by Schleus.

7. οὐ γὰρ—σωφρονισμοῦ. The Apostle here hints at the faculty which especially required rousing, namely, his *courage*. Here we have the use of ἡμῖν for σοι ; which figure (κοίνωσις) is frequent in the Apostle. The phraseology, however, is somewhat obscure, and thus has been variously interpreted. Some take the δυν. of the *power of working miracles*, and σωφρονισμοῦ of the teaching of the Spirit. But though this is maintained, with ability, by Whitby, it is somewhat precarious. His note, however, deserves attentive perusal. Neither can I approve of πνεῦμα δειλίας being taken simply for *animus timidus* ; and πνεῦμα δυνάμεως, *animus fortis*. The whole difficulty (I conceive) arises from the extreme brevity of the phraseology. And the sense is best expressed by Theophyl. thus : οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἐλάβομεν τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ὑποστελλώμεθα, ἀλλ' ἵνα δυνατοὶ ᾖμεν πρὸς τοὺς πειρασμοὺς, καὶ παρρησιαζώμεθα. He interprets the ἀγάπης of “love to God and man, as inwrought by Divine grace.” The σωφρονισμοῦ he paraphrases :

ἵνα σώφρονες ὦμεν, καὶ ὑγιεῖς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ ἐν καταστάσει. The whole passage is well paraphrased by Theodoret thus: Τοῦ παναγίου γὰρ Πνεύματος τὴν χάριν δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός, οὐχ ἵνα δειλιῶμεν τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας κινδύνους, ἀλλ' ἵνα θείας δυνάμεως ἐμφορούμενοι, θερμῶς μὲν αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσωμεν, σωφρονίσωμεν δὲ τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν κινουμένων παθημάτων τὴν ἀταξίαν.

How opposite this σωφρ. is to that *fanatical spirit* by some regarded as the highest ministerial endowment, it is easy to see. Benson observes that by "having *the spirit*" they could not only work miracles, but, if they rightly improved that extraordinary illumination, it produced the moral virtues of fortitude, benevolence, and discretion.

8. μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆς—αὐτοῦ. The Apostle now expresses his meaning more clearly, and hints that this δειλία had been evinced by not coming to Rome, lest he should be involved in the persecution of his master. And then, in a long drawn, but beautiful passage, he sets before him the momentous nature of that for which he is called upon to encounter persecution, namely, the salvation to be attained by the gracious calling of God, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel. Thus, he shows, there is no reason to fear or decline persecution. Such is, I conceive, the general scope of the passage.

Μαρτύριον may denote either the *doctrine itself*, or the *profession* of it, or both. Δέσμιος αὐτοῦ, "a prisoner on his account, in his cause." So Theophyl., δι' αὐτὸν. Compare Phil. 3, 1., where see the note. And elsewhere the Apostle says, "I am not ashamed of the cross of Christ." Theophyl. finely paraphrases: "If Christ was not ashamed of the cross, how can I be ashamed of these bonds?"

The words συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κ. δ. Θ. are obscure from their brevity. There are two ways in which they may be taken, both of which had occurred to the antients. Thus Theophyl. (after Chrys.) paraphrases: μὴ ἀπλῶς δείξῃς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπαισ-

χύνῃ, ἀλλὰ τῇ πείρᾳ καὶ διὰ τῶν ἔργων, καὶ κοινωνῶνς γενοῦ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ ἐμοὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. He then observes, that as the Gospel cannot itself be said κακοπαθεῖν, we may either take τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ for διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, “for the Gospel’s sake;” or by εὐαγγ. understand all the *preachers* of it; q. d. συγκακοπάθησον τοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The former method is adopted by most modern Commentators, as Wolf, Rosenm., Heinr., Schleus., and Mackn.; but the latter, which is adopted by Grot., Est., and others, including Valpy, seems the more natural and easy. This kind of *prosopopæia* is frequent in the Apostle. The συγκακοπαθ. must not be confined to *Paul*, but extended to all the preachers of the Gospel.

8. κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, “according to, in dependance on, by the use of.” So Theophyl.: τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Θεοῦ. A somewhat unusual sense of κατὰ, in the use of which preposition the Apostle allows himself much license.

9, 10. τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς, καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγία. By σωσ., the best Commentators are agreed, is meant *put into the way of salvation*. See the note on Matt. 1, 21. Καλ. κλήσει ἁγία, see Gal. 1, 6. and the note. The ἁγ. may be compared with the ἡ ἄνω κλήσις, Phil. 3, 14., and the κλήσις ἐπουράνιος, Heb. 3, 1. Nor is there (as Heinr. fancies) any imitation of Jewish phraseology. The epithet respects the *purpose* of that calling, namely, “to make us holy and therefore happy, and raise us to heaven.” I am surprised that the Commentators (who treat this point in a very perfunctory manner) should not have thought of comparing 1 Pet. 1, 15., which is the best commentary on the passage: “As he who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy,” &c.

The next words show that this salvation is not of works but of grace: a doctrine which the Apostle often inculcates (as Eph. 2, 8. Tit. 3, 5., &c.), and it is here very aptly introduced, since there was the more reason for Timothy not to decline persecution

or toil in the cause of Him by whom he had been saved *wholly by grace*. Πρόθεσιν is for προαίρεσιν. See Eph. 3, 11. Rom. 9, 11. and the note. Heinr. observes that δίδοναι is for ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι. But there is much meaning in this use: for what is promised or intended by God may, in a manner, from its certainty, be regarded as already given. Φανερωθεῖσαν refers to χάριν.

10. καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον—εὐαγγελίου. Theophyl. well paraphrases: Ἐν τῷ οἰκίῳ σώματι κατήργησεν ἐμπράκτως τὸν θάνατον, ἀφθαρτίσας αὐτὸ· ἡμᾶς δὲ ἐφώτισε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλπίζειν τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, οὐ γὰρ ἤδη ἡμεῖς ἠφθαρτίσθημεν ἐνεργείᾳ, ἀλλὰ μέλλομεν, καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν ἐβεβαίωσεν. “The Apostle (says Benson) is not speaking of the immortality of the soul, but of the resurrection of the dead, and the consequent state of incorruption and immortality; a state wherein this corruptible body shall become incorruptible, and *death* so entirely *abolished* as to have place no more.” “He hath (says Mackn.) deprived death of its power to continue mankind in the state of the dead. By submitting to death, he hath procured for all men a resurrection from the dead; and for the righteous, an eternal life in the body after the resurrection. Hence the Apostle telleth us, Heb. 2, 14., the Son of God partook of flesh and blood, that through death, καταργησῇ, *he might destroy him who had the power of death*.” In ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν there is thought to be an hendiadis. The sense of the words is admirably illustrated by Whitby in loc. See also Tillots. Serm. 3, 112., and Warburton’s Divine Legation, vol. 1. et passim.

On φωτίσαντος I would compare Arrian Epict. 1, 4. s. f. τῷ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐρόντι καὶ φωτίσαντι.

11. εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη—ἐθνῶν. The εἰς is well rendered *whereunto* (so the Classical ἐφ’ ὅπερ); for it regards all the preceding. Compare a similar passage at

1 Tim. 2, 7. St. Paul calls himself ἀποστολὸς ἐθνῶν, since to *their* salvation his labours were *chiefly* (though not entirely) devoted.

12. οἶδα γάρ, &c. Heinr. observes, that the words of this involved sentence may be thus digested : οἶδα γὰρ καὶ πέπαισμαι, ὅτι (ἐκεῖνος Θεός), ᾧ πεπίστευκα τὴν παραθήκην μου, δυνατὸς ἐστι, φυλάξαι ταύτην τὴν παρ. μου εἰς ἐκ. τ. ἡμ. The sense of the παραθήκην is obscure, and variously interpreted, even by the ancients. Thus Theophyl. first explains it τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα : but then he adds, that it may signify the *persons* whom He had brought to Christ, or the ἀντιμισθίαν, which is said to be laid up with God for the righteous. See Col. 1, 5. and 2 Tim. 4. 8. Of these expositions the first alone deserves attention, and it has been adopted by many eminent moderns. See Rosemn., Mackn., Pyle, Schleus., and Jaspis. Yet it seems too harsh ; and I cannot but prefer the interpretation of those (as Whitby, Benson, Fessel, Bos, Capell, Krebs, and Slade) who understand it of the *soul*. So Benson : “ I suffer, and am in near prospect of a violent death ; but I am not ashamed. For I know very well whom I have trusted with my soul. And am firmly persuaded that he is able to keep that *depositum* of mine, and to restore it safe unto me, in the judgment of the great day.” It is truly remarked by Slade, that the phrase τὴν παραθήκην μου, more usually signifies, “ what I have deposited with another,” than, “ what another has deposited with me.” Accordingly, in ver. 14. and 1 Tim. 6, 20., it is τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον, and not τὴν παρακαταθήκην σου. And further, since the Apostle there speaks of Timothy keeping the deposit which was entrusted to *him*, it is fair to presume, that since God is here spoken of as *keeping* the deposit, it means the deposit entrusted to *Him*. Thus 1 Pet. 4, 19. ὡς πιστῶ κτιστῇ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν.

The expression “ *that day*,” is often used, as here, κατ’ ἐξοχὴν, to denote the day of judgment. And

this idiom (as Heinr. observes) arose from its being the subject of daily conversation among the Christians of that age.

13. ὑποτύπωσιν—Ἰησοῦ. Now follow some exhortations, first a more general one, founded on the excellence of the religion itself, and then some more special ones. On ὑποτυπ. see the note on 1 Tim. 1, 16. The construction of the whole verse is thus laid down by Rosenm.: ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν ὑγιαίνόντων λόγων, ὧν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας ἔχε ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ. And he renders: "Summam doctrinarum saluberrimarum, quas edoctus es a me, retine cum fide et charitate, quæ huic doctrinæ Christi conformis est." On ὑγ. λογ. see the note on 1 Tim. 1, 10. and 6, 3. "He was to hold fast (observes Benson) even the form of sound words, which he had received from the Apostle, not only *in faith*, or with fidelity; but with *love* and *charity* towards all honest minds; though they might not have so much knowledge as he had; or might differ from him in some particulars."

14. τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην—ἡμῖν. The same sentiment, in other words. By the παρακατ. must be understood the deposit of sound Gospel doctrine committed to him by Paul. The sense of διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, is strangely lowered by some moderns from Benson downwards, who interpret it, "a holy disposition:" which is harsh and unsuitable to the context; and though Benson refers to supra ver. 5. and Col. 3, 16., yet neither passage has any such sense. (See the notes there.) I cannot but acquiesce in the antient and common interpretation, "by the aid of the Holy Spirit, and not by human strength only."

15. οἶδας τοῦτο—Ἀσίᾳ. After these premises, the Apostle proposes to him examples, partly for warning and partly for imitation. (Heinr.) The οἶδας τοῦτο ὅτι, is rendered by Rosenm. *puto scire te*. But the τοῦτο, used in conjunction with the ὅτι is, by no means without force, Angl. *This you know, that,*

&c. Ἀπεστράφησαν does not so much mean *have abandoned the religion*, as, *are alienated from me*, as it should seem, from a cowardly fear of participating in his persecution. By *Asia* is supposed to be meant *Ephesus*, and the vicinity. But it must at least denote the whole of *Ionian*, of which Ephesus was the capital. And so it is taken at Acts 16, 6., and many other passages adduced by Schleus., who observes, that Strabo, L. 14. applies this name to *Ionian* only.

The πάντες may be taken popularly for *permulti*, in a manner *all*. Ὡν is for ἐξ ὧν. Of Phygellus and Hermogenes nothing certain is known. Ecclesiastical tradition, however, affords some information.

16. δῶν ἔλεος—οἴκῳ. A brief mode of expression for, “this did not Onesiphorus, whose family may the Lord, &c. Ἐλεος, “beneficium:” for according to the Scriptural usage God’s *benefits* are called his *mercies*, to hint our unworthiness of them. This Onesiphorus, Rosenm. thinks was a *freedman*, and from what the Apostle says at 4, 19., was then *dead*. Or, as Benson observes, the Apostle knew he was not then at Ephesus.

Ἀνέψυξε. See the note on Col. 4, 11. The metaphor, Rosenm. thinks, is derived from those who are overcome with *thirst*; but I should rather think *heat*. It seems to properly signify, “bring a person to life again (ἀνα) who is fainting with heat by *fanning* him. And so (I find) Heinr.

16. τὴν ἄλυσιν μου οὐκ ἐπῆσχύνθη, “*He* was not ashamed of my chain.” A figurative expression for, “he was not ashamed of me a prisoner.” Rosenm. cites Cicero in Lælio: “quàm graves, quàm difficiles plerisque videntur calamitatum societates! ad quas non est facilè inventus qui descendat.” The same sentiment occurs more than once in the Psalms.

17, 18. γεγόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ, “when he was in Rome;” whither business would often bring the inhabitants of so commercial a city as Ephesus.

Theophyl. renders: οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἔφυγέ μου τὴν συντυχίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπεζητήσέ με, καὶ εὗρεν ὃ μεγάλης ἀνδρείας καὶ πίστεως. The words Δῶη—ἡμέρα are parenthetical. Εὗρεῖν signifies to *obtain*. Ἐλεος *acceptance and salvation*. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ, *the day of judgment*; as *supra*, ver. 12. The repetition of Κυρίου instead of αὐτοῦ, is regarded by Rosem. as a Hebraism. And he compares Joh. 11, 22. and Susan. 55. So Theophyl. and many moderns. Some antients, however, and moderns, as Wetstein, take the first Κυρίου to denote God the Father; and the second, God the Son. And Wets. refers to Gen. 1, 27. 5, 1. 9, 6 & 16. 19, 24. 35, 1. Ex. 16, 7 & 29. 31, 3. 35, 31. 1 Kings 8, 1. 12, 21. 2 Chron. 11, 1. Num. 10, 29. If the Apostle intended this, the passage would strengthen the doctrine of the Trinity.

At ὅσα must be understood κατὰ. And διηκόνησε must, from the context, refer *not* (as some say) to the Christians at large, but to the Apostle himself. Βέλτιον has not the comparative force, but signifies *very well*.

On this passage the Romanists found their practice of praying for the dead. For they infer from 4, 19. that Onesiphorus was *dead*. But that is very uncertain; and if it *were* the case, this can hardly be called a *prayer*. It may rather be regarded as a *pious wish*.

CHAP. II.

VER. 1. συ οὖν, τ. μ., ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The same exhortation is repeated. It had already occurred, ch. 1, 6, 7, 8, 13 & 14. We may observe, however, that the Apostle has always brought it forward in different words, and under different images. (Heinr.) The οὖν is well paraphrased by Theodoret ταῦτα εἰδὼς, “knowing this defection, and the dangers above adverted to.” Ενδυν., *strengthen thyself*. Heinr. here, comparing

Eph. 6, 10., drily remarks that this is one of those words by which constancy and firmness in retaining a new religion is denoted; as *στηρίζεσθαι*, Gal. 5., *βεβαιουῖσθαι*, Hebr. 13, 9., &c. The *χάριτι* both he and Rosenm. take to mean the *munus Apostolicum*. But nothing can be more harsh. Neither is the interpretation of Benson much better, “strengthen yourself in true Christianity.” The *ἐν* is plainly taken for the Hebr. *ב*, *by the means of*: and the antient and common interpretation alone bears the stamp of truth. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): *μὴ μόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ κατ’ ἐμὲ ὑποδείγματος ἐνδυναμοῦ, ἀλλὰ μάλιστα διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐκεινὴν ἔχε συναγωνιζομένην, δι’ ἧς, &c.* And Theodoret: *στῇθι ἀνδρείως· ὑπερείδει γὰρ σε τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ χάρις.* So also Doddr.: “in humble dependence upon divine grace.”

2. καὶ ἃ ἤκουσας—ἀνθρώποις. The Commentators, antient and modern, have been not a little perplexed with the *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων*. Some take it of the law and the Prophets. Others, as Theodoret, explain: *ἅπερ ἤκουσάς μου πολλοὺς διδάσκοντας.* So Theophyl. and Œcumen.: *οὐ λάθρα, ἀλλὰ μετὰ παρρησίας, πολλῶν παρόντων.* Which is preferable to some other interpretations (as the visionary one of Mackn.), and *may* represent the true sense: but I am inclined to adopt that of Vatab., Beza, Est., Wolf, Rosenm., and Heinr., who think the Apostle has reference to the solemn ordination of Timothy to the episcopal office, alluded to at 1 Tim. 1, 18. 4, 14. 6, 12. 2 Tim. 1, 6., and which was, no doubt, accompanied with a *public charge* (for such seems to be meant by the *ἃ ἤκουσας παρ’ ἐμοῦ*), the substance of which he desires may be repeated to others. The *witnesses* were the presbyters present, and perhaps the congregation. See the notes on the above cited passages.

The metaphor in *παρεθ.* is similar to that in *παρά-θήκη*, or *παρακαταθήκη*, supra 1, 14. 1 Pet. 4, 19. and elsewhere. The *πίστοις* and *ἐτέροις*, &c. advert to the

two principal qualifications requisite, *fidelity* and *fitness for teaching*. So Theophyl.: διδακτικοῖς. See 1 Tim. 3, 2. and 2 Tim. 2, 24.

3. σὺ οὖν κακοπάθησον—Χριστοῦ. Here we have plainly a military metaphor. Καλὸς signifies δοκιμὸς. Rosenm. refers to Poll. 1, 11. The Commentators aptly compare 1 Tim. 1, 1, 18. τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν στρατεύειν, and 6, 12. τὸν καλὸν ἀγὼν ἀγωνίζεσθαι.* But many are the duties of the soldier besides fighting (and such κακοπαθεῖν is often employed by the Greek Historians to denote); and when we take the admonition συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, supra 1, 8. (where see the note,) in conjunction with this, we shall see that the Apostle here adverts to the labours of *propagating* as well as *defending* the Gospel. Nor can I recognise, with Heinr., an agonistical allusion.

4. οὐδεὶς στρατεύόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις. The στρατ. is *emphatical*; “No one who warreth,” &c. Ἐμπλέκεται, middle voice, *entangleth himself with, engages in*. The τοῦ βίου πραγ. may very well be rendered, the *business* of life, traffic and commutation of every kind. Τοῦ βίου does not merely mean (as Heinr. explains) *ad vitam tolerandam*, but, in a general way, to use the words of Cicero de Offic. 2, 11., *ad rem gerendam*.

The fact is proved by Wetstein’s citations. Thus it is said in a Novella of the Civilians, “indigna est et pudenda armato viro negotiatio. And so Ambros

* I add Valer. Max. L. 8, 5. Carneades laboriosus et diuturnus sapientiæ miles. Juncus ap. Stob. Sermon. 594. 5. ὥσπερ καλὸς ἀθλήτης, &c. Max. Tyr. Diss. 3. p. 32. νόει μοι στρατηγὸν μὲν τὸν Θεὸν, στρατείαν δὲ τὴν ζωὴν, ὀπλίτην δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. And the same metaphor is used by Theophr. Cornic. ap. Athen. 562 F. The *sentiment* may be illustrated from Philostr. V. Ap. 1, 35. (p. 43.) τὸν ἄνδρα ἡγοῦμαι τὸν σόφον πλείω κινδυνεύειν, ἢ οἱ πλείοντες τε καὶ ἔξιν ὅπλοις μαχόμενοι· φθόνος γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν στείχει, καὶ σιωπῶντα, καὶ φθεγγόμενον, καὶ ξυντείνοντα, καὶ ἀνιέντα, καὶ παρελθὼν τί· καὶ προσέλθῃ τῷ, καὶ προσείπῃ, καὶ μὴ προσείπῃ· δεῖ δὲ πέφραχθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, γινώσκειν τε ὡς ἀργίας μὲν ἡττηθεὶς ὁ σόφος, ἢ χολῆς, ἢ ἔρωτος, ἢ φιλοποσίας, ἢ ἐτοιμότερόν τι τοῦ καιροῦ πράξας, ἴσως ἂν καὶ ξυγγνώμην φέροιτο· χρήμασι δὲ ὑποθεὶς ἑαυτὸν, οὐτ’ ἂν ξυγγινώσκοιτο, καὶ μισοῖτ’ ἂν, ὡς ὁμοῦ πάσας κακίας συνεληφώς.

de Offic. 1, 36. Is qui imperatori militat, a susceptionibus litium, actu forensium negotiorum, venditione mercium prohibetur.*

The argument (Rosenm. observes) drawn from a secular warfare is, à fortiori, applicable to the spiritual. Besides, if (as we learn from Acts 6, 5.) "it was not reasonable ministers should leave the work of God, and serve tables," how much less so for them to be engaged in far less justifiable pursuits! Deeply is it to be lamented that there should be *any individuals* amongst our own body so far absorbed in secular occupations, and engrossed in ignoble pursuits (see Joseph. 127, 32—42. and 1286.) as to possess little leisure, and less *inclination*, to prosecute those professional studies which can alone enable them "rightly to divide the word of truth," or successfully "to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints."

4. ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ, "that he may approve himself unto," &c. The στρατολογ. signifies literally the *person who enlisted him*, i. e. the Emperor, or Dux. The application is obvious. It is not, however, necessary, with Heinr., to consider *Paul* as the στρατ., but *Jesus Christ*. For soldiers, though enlisted by any *officer*, are only enlisted in the *name* of the commander in chief, or monarch with whom their *engagement* is really made.

5. εἰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ—ἀθλήσῃ. On the military allusion the Apostle engrafts an agonistical metaphor. The sense is: "Thus also, if any one contend, or be an athlete, he does not gain the prize, unless he contend in the regular way." The νομίμως (I conceive) refers not only to the laws regulating the *mode* in which the candidates should contest, but also the *rules* laid down, and enforced by the trainers, without the observance of which there was no chance of

* Arrian. Epict. 3, 22. ὡς ἐν παρατάξει, μηποτ' ἀπερίσπαστον εἶναι δεῖ, ὅλον πρὸς τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ—οὐ προσδεδεμένον καθήκονσιν ιδιωτικοῖς, οὐδ' ἐμπεπλεγμένον σχέσεων.

gaining the prize.* This is especially illustrated from the Classical writers from Grot. and Wets. Thus Galen: οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες. Arrian. Epict. 3, 16. εἰ νομίμως ἔβλησας. The words νόμιμος and νομίμως were also applied to *soldiers*. Not only did a candidate fail of gaining the prize, but he was disgraced, and sometimes punished. See Herod. 8, 59. where consult Wass and Valckn.

6. τὸν κοπιῶντα — μεταλαμβάνειν. The Apostle again changes the metaphor, and that to the *husbandman*. Similar ones are found in 1 Cor. 9, 10. Hebr. 6, 7. and James 5, 7.† The construction is here somewhat harsh; insomuch that critical conjectures have been resorted to; yet unnecessarily, though the obscurity has occasioned some diversity of interpretation. Our Common Version renders: “The husbandman that laboureth must be first partaker of the fruits.” And this is supported by the antients and some moderns. But the sense is very harsh and inapposite. For (as Dodd. observes) whether the husbandman was to receive the fruits *first*, was not the point in question. And (as Wolf remarks) the Apostle does not so much call Timothy’s attention to the *fruits* to be expected or received from his labours, as he exhorts him to order and diligence in his *office*. I must therefore acquiesce in the opinion of Grot., Erasm., Beza, Schmid, Gataker, Capell., Wolf, and most recent Commentators, that there is here a transposition, and the πρῶτον must be taken with the preceding κοπιῶντα, not the following μεταλαμβάνειν. It was (as Dodd. says) the Apostle’s

* So Theophyl.: οὐκ ἔαν εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα εἰσέλθῃ, ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο οὐδὲ ἔαν ἀλείψῃται, οὐδὲ ἔαν συμπλακῇ, ἀλλ’ ἔαν μὴ καὶ τοὺς περὶ βρωμάτων καὶ πομάτων, καὶ σωφροσύνης ἀθλητικούς νόμους φυλάξῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ πρόπῳ τῆς πάλης.

† “The inhabitants of Judæa spent much of their time in the cultivation of corn, olives, and vines, and lived much in the open air; hence (it should seem) the frequent allusions of the sacred writers to rural scenery and rural occupation.” (Dr. Maltby in his Notes to his Second Volume of Sermons.)

purpose to remind Timothy that the labour of the husbandman must precede the harvest.

7. νόει—πάντων. These examples the Apostle follows up with earnest admonition, and affectionate wish and prayer.

The reading δώσει, put by Griesb. nearly on a footing with the textual one, is a mere *emendation* from some who stumbled at the γάρ, which, however, may be regarded as almost pleonastic. Wolf has satisfactorily shown that that reading is indefensible.

7. ἐν παντί “in all things;” both words and works. So Œcumen. Σύνεσιν, *spiritual understanding*.

8. μνημόνευε—εὐαγγέλιόν μου. This seems to be a continuation of the above admonition at νόει ἃ λέγω; (the δώη—πάντων being, in some measure, parenthetical); by the use of other arguments, namely, derived from the resurrection of Christ, &c. The words are well paraphrased by Rosenm.: “If tribulations befall me or thee, remember that Jesus Christ who suffered an ignominious death, was raised again by God to a glorious life. Such will be our case if we remain steadfast and undaunted.”

8. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, “according to the Gospel taught you by me;” as contrasted with that of the Judaizers. See Benson. Ἐν ᾧ κατοπαθῶ, “in the cause of which I labour, travail, and encounter peril.” For κακ. must be taken in the same extent of signification as supra ver. 3. Grot. thinks the word also includes the idea of *patient endurance*. Μέχρι δεσμῶν, “Said *exaggeranter* (observes Rosenm.); since this confinement was the φυλακὴ ἁδεσμός.” But that (as I have shown on the Acts) is a point very undetermined. The word, however, was often applied to any imprisonment, whether in fetters or not. Ως, “as if I were.”

The turn at ἀλλ' ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται is very skilful, and would not have been unworthy of Demosthenes himself. Rosenm. paraphrases: “it will always be propagated, though I am in bonds.” And

so Wolf. But the meaning must rather be: "the word of God, as regards me." And so Theodoret. The other sense, however, may be included. Schliting and Benson have alone seen the scope of the words, namely, "that is my comfort and your's."

10. διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομένω. The διὰ τοῦτο is by some referred to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; by others, to οὐ δέδε-ται; q. d. "in order that this should not be bound I bear all things." Benson interprets: "as the Gospel is at liberty." Others otherwise. But perhaps it merely answers to the Hebr. וְלִי, which has sometimes little perceptible meaning, as seems to be the case with the διὰ τοῦτο; for the sense is complete without it. There may, however, be included an elliptical force, to be thus supplied: "And why do I bear all things? For *this*, namely, for the elect's sake, &c. Rosenm. supposes an asyndeton, and supplies καὶ at 1 Cor. 11, 10. I would point thus: Διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομενῶ, διὰ, &c. Rosenm. paraphrases: "omnia sustineo: quia nempe confido, Christum mihi vincto etiam adfuturum, causam meam tuiturum, et me, ipsius gratia patientem, honoribus, præmiis atque splendore sic decoraturum esse, ut me perperessionis pudere aut poenitere non possit." But this cannot (I think) be the sense intended. For (as Theophyl. observes) the Apostle means to say that he suffers this not so much for himself, as for the salvation of others. And so Œcumen. Ἐν Χ., *by* Christ. Μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου, "together with eternal glory." Rosenm., strangely, interprets the words, as if they related to the *present* advantages only of the Gospel; which the μετὰ δόξης αἰων. forbids. So Theophyl.: οὐ μόνον ἵνα σωθῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μείζον, ἵνα καὶ δοξασθῶσι μετ' ἡμῶν αἰωνίως.

By the τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς the best antient and modern Interpreters are agreed is meant, *all* faithful Christians, not the *Gentile* Christians only, as Benson supposes. Though it should seem that the Apostle did not mean to include the *Judaizers*, since they were

not faithful, and therefore not elect. The *καὶ αὐτοὶ* (which is strangely misunderstood by some) simply means, *they as well as myself*.

11. *πιστὸς—συζήσομεν*. The article here stands for the pronoun demonstrative, q. d. *this* is a saying of undoubted certainty (a formula occurring also at 1 Tim. 1 15. 3, 1. 4, 9.), this which *follows* : for it does not relate (as Heinr. fancies) to what preceded. The assurance was meant to silence their doubts, and strengthen their resolution to encounter persecution. *Συναπεθάνομεν*, “die martyrs as he died.” *Συζήσομεν*, “enjoy life and happiness with him.” In the clause *εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν* there is a fine *climax*. On the *συμβ.* see Rom. 5, 17. and the note there. Heinr. compares Epict. Enchirid. c. 21. οὐ μόνον συμπότης τῶν θεῶν ἔση, ἀλλὰ καὶ συναρχὼν. On *ἀρν.* see the note on 1 Tim. 5, 8. The sense is obvious.

13. *εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν—δύναται*. The sense of these words is somewhat obscure, partly from brevity, and partly from the construction being adapted rather to the *antithesis*, than to the *sentiment*. It hinges on the words *ἀπιστοῦμεν* and *ἀρνήσασθαι οὐ δύναται*. The ancients interpret : “Whether we believe or disbelieve his resurrection and Messiahship, Christ will be true, and the same will gain nothing by our belief, nor lose any thing by our disbelief.” And so many moderns. But this seems scarcely an apposite sense, and does not arise naturally out of the words. As the *ἀπιστ.* has *πιστ.* corresponding to it, I agree with the best modern Commentators, that it must denote *failing in our fidelity to Christ* ; which may be (as Benson says) “by *denying* the Christian religion, or rejecting it ; by *corrupting* it, or mingling another doctrine with it ; or by *living unworthy* of it. If we should prove *unfaithful*, any of these ways, yet *Christ is faithful*, and must disown us, as none of his disciples.” The *unfaithfulness* here spoken of seems to have been denying the Christian religion, in the time of persecution, in order to avoid suffering. See

Doddr. The above interpretation is ably supported by Rosenm. and Heinr., and is, undoubtedly, the true one. "By *cannot deny himself*" (observes Rosenm.) is meant, cannot act contrary to his nature, which is altogether veracious, cannot deny that he is Christ, and that what he has taught us is true." Consequently, he can appoint no other ἀντίδοσις, retribution, whether for good or evil, than his declarations authorize us to expect.

14. ταῦτα ὑπομίμνησκε—ἀκούοντων, "of these things remind the teachers committed to your superintendence." Benson thinks that by these are meant the *Judaizers*. Be that as it may, it appears, by the words following, that *teachers* are meant. And so Est. and Rosenm. On διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου see 1 Tim., 5, 21., and the note. And on λογομαχεῖν see 1 Tim., 6, 4. At ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ the ἀλλὰ is omitted, by asyndeton. The sense of the rest is obvious.

15. σπούδασον—ἀληθείας.

After having shown what preachers of God's word ought *not* to be, the Apostle shows what they *ought to be*. In the present weighty admonition the nature of the *metaphor* used by the Apostle has been a matter of some doubt with the Commentators. Many moderns recognize, in the ὀρθοτομοῦντα, an allusion to the Jewish Priests cutting or dividing a sacrifice into its proper parts; or to the scribes dividing the Law into sections (see Benson and Doddr.); or to a carver distributing the meat to the guests; or, again, to a steward dealing out the articles committed to his management. But all these opinions seem destitute of any authority. The most popular interpretation, for the last century, and one which carries the greatest semblance of truth, is that of Greg. Nazienz., ably supported by Elsner, Obs. 2, 311., Wets., in loc., and many others. It is, they say, a metaphor taken from those who proceed by a direct road, leaving crooked and winding paths: for, in the Greek language, the act of proceeding directly is called τέμνειν ὄδον, or κελεύθον εὐθείαν, and, in the Latin, *viam secure*. But there are two reasons which prevent me from acceding to this interpretation. In the first place, it drops the idea of ἐργατής. But it is well known that ἔργα is, by the writers of antiquity, peculiarly applied to the labours of *husbandry*; and it will readily occur to any one, that men engaged in agriculture are, in our own tongue, called *labourers*; while the term *workmen* is used, with greater variety and extent, of *artizans*. My second reason is this: The explanation in question does not sufficiently unfold that part of the compound word ὀρθοτομοῦντα,

which imports the *act of cutting, or dividing*; and which leads me to think that the Apostle had in view *the act of ploughing, when the furrows are made straight*.*

Most of the above statement is derived from an Episcopal Visitation Sermon, by me, published many years ago by Messrs. Rivington, and to the copious notes on which I refer for further details, only observing, that the interpretation is supported by the authority of Chrysostom and Theodoret.

16. τὰς δὲ βεβήλους κενοφωνίας περιίστατο. With this we may compare the ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας of 1 Tim., 6, 20., the τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ of 1 Tim., 4, 7. (where see the note), and the μωρὰς ζητήσεις παραιτοῦ, *infra*, ver. 23. See also 3, 9. The verb περιίστάσθαι, signifies to *keep oneself aloof from, avoid*, literally, by running round (περὶ) a pillar, or any other object. See the Classical citations of Kypke and Wets.

At τροκοψ. (a term used both in a bad, and good sense), the construction requires us to understand the βεβηλοὶ κενοφωνίαι, which is taken by the Commentators as put, by the πρὸς τὸ σημαίνονμενον, for the *persons* so acting. But it rather seems to mean the *use of such sophisms*, &c., which, in Christians, and especially Christian *teachers*, may very well be called ἀσεβείαι; since the holding and the promulgating of such is inconsistent with our bounden duty to God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, to honour him with our body and with our spirit, which are God's, to submit our *imagination*s, as well as regulate our *actions*, by the will of Him who worketh all in all.

The κενοφων. Chrys. explains by καινοτομ. In which I am not prepared to agree with him: and yet I cannot but think that, in many respects, as regards the Theology of a neighbouring country, the two words are too often convertible terms: and I would to God that those to whom this whole passage may be so fairly applied, would seriously reflect on the consequences of such unbounded speculation,

* To which purpose there is an interesting passage in Hesiod Op. 41—3. (on ploughing straight) "Ὅς κ' ἔργου μελετῶν ἰθεῖαν αὐτὰκ' ἐλαύνει Μῆκετι παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήλικας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἔργῳ θυμὸν ἔχων. See also Theocr. Id. 10., *init.*

and "turn from these vanities to serve the living God."

17. καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἔξει. The γάγγρ., Rosenm. observes, is not the same as the cancer, but something very like it. Castell., in his Lex. Med., calls it an *incipient mortification*, by some called St. Anthony's fire. So Jaspis: "Morbus est, quo pars quædam corporis, vi inflammationis laborans, ita corrupta est, ut, nisi maturè et opportunè auxilium feratur, malum, latius in dies se diffundens, vi veneni sui totum corpus carie arrodât ac perdat."

The νομὴν ἔξει is a peculiar phrase, with which the Commentators compare νομὴν ποιεῖσθαι, and λαμβάνειν, and that for νέμεσθαι and its compounds. So the Vulg. *serpit*. But it should seem that ἔξει signifies *carries with it*. Νομή, like νέμεσθαι, is used of such *putrifying sores* as communicate corruption to the parts adjacent. One may compare a similar passage of Acts 4, 17., where, speaking metaphorically of a supposed false and pernicious opinion, it is said: ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλείον διανεμηθῇ, Rosenm. cites from Plut. (respecting the feigned praises of adulators), γαγγραινας καὶ καρκινώματα. The moral application is obvious.

18. περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἡστόχησαν. So 1 Tim., 6, 21., περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστ. (where see the note), and 1 Tim., 4, 5., τὰς ἀληθείας ἀποστερεῖσθαι. On the nature of the opinions so described no certainty can be attained: and the opinions of Commentators are, as usual, various. Most think that these were persons who held that the resurrection preached by Jesus was purely a metaphorical and spiritual one, and that that was past; that virtue was its own reward in this life, and all that it could expect: for, as Sadducees and Materialists, by denying the resurrection of the body, they denied all future existence. (See the instructive note of Mackn.) On the other hand, Benson, and most recent Commentators, suppose their opinions to have been much the same with those of Marcion and the Gnostics, as stated by

Epiphanius. Hæres. 42., “non carnis sed animæ resurrectionem esse credendam.” And Benson thinks that Marcion believed in the separate existence of the soul. But such could not be the opinion of Hymeneus and Philetus; for, according to the Apostle, they held that there was only *one* resurrection, and that *past*. They, therefore, evidently thought it the same with baptismal regeneration. Marcion seems to have maintained *two* resurrections, one present and figurative; the other future and real, namely, of the soul; whereas, by the τὴν ἀναστ., it is implied that Hymeneus and Philetus held but *one*.

At ἀνατρέπουσι, Pricæus observes, there is a metaphor taken from undermining any building, in conformity with which there is added ὁ στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔστηκεν.

19. ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος ἔστηκεν.

This is a passage of no ordinary difficulty, on which the opinions of Commentators are very various. The most favourite one, for the last half century is, that as σφραγὶς often denotes an *inscription*, so it may here be used in allusion to the custom of engraving on a slab deposited at the foundation of a building, indicating the purpose of its erection. Thus, by θεμελ., they understand the *religion* which has God for its author, the chief purposes of which are adverted to in the two sentences following. Thus Heinr. renders: “Sed licet labantes nonnullorum animos seducant, ipsum tamen religionis fundamentum revellere requibunt.” And he compares Matt. 16, 18. He then adds: “Et h. l. religionem sistit ut ædificium, seu templum, solidissimè fundatum, litterisque majusculis sententiâ quadam breviori inscriptum.” Jaspis observes, that σφραγὶς is, properly, the fundamental stone; and that such had inscriptions, appears from Apoc. 21, 14. So Theophyl.: ἔχων ὡς ἀντὶ λίθος τε γράμματά τινα καὶ γνωρίσματα ἐγκεκολλημένα αὐτῷ δι’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων, καὶ αὐτῷ ἐφαρμόζοντα, τὸ, “Εγὼ κύριος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Abp. Tillotson and Benson take θεμέλιος to mean a *covenant*. But that is devoid of authority, and little agreeable to the context. Slade and Valpy adopt the interpretation of Wells: “Nevertheless, the foundation of God, i. e. the fundamental doctrine of the resurrection, whereon principally God has designed the truth of the Gospel to be built, standeth sure and firm, having this seal, i. e. being confirmed after the same way as God confirmed the authority of Moses and Aaron against the gainsayings of Korah and his companions, namely, when in reply to Korah, Moses answered, Numb. 16, 5., “The Lord knoweth them that are his;” and when he said to the congregation of Israel, in reference to Korah, &c. Numb. 16, 26. “Depart from the tents of these wicked men.” But this

seems very harsh as respects the ἔγνω—Χριστοῦ. Theodoret paraphrases thus : παρασαλευσαι οὐ δύναται τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας κρηπίδα· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ τοῦτον τέθεικε τὸν θεμελίον· σφραγὶς δὲ τοῦ θεμελίου, τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἢ ἐλπίς. Perhaps the interpretation first mentioned may be united with this; q. d. "The main fabric itself, and especially that fundamental doctrine of the resurrection, standeth firm." And then what is added may be understood of the *religion*, not the *doctrine*. And, certainly, in respect to religion, the two sentences which are supposed to be inscribed upon it, contain matter for serious meditation, and constant recollection to all its professors. 1st., ἔγνω κ. τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ, "The Lord knoweth who are really his." See Joh. 13, 18., Neh. 1, 17., Num. 16, 5. 2nd., Ἀποστήτω, &c., "Let every professor of the Christian religion depart from iniquity." See Whithy and Benson. This should, therefore, seem directed against those false teachers who, though holding doctrines subversive of the religion of God, yet professed to be his faithful worshippers; and though professing a religion which was introduced to purify men from iniquity, yet were too little careful to observe it in their actions.

20. ἐν μεγάλῃ—εἰς ἀτιμίαν. This passage partakes of the difficulty which envelops the preceding, chiefly because the application of the similitude is wanting; as Rom. 5, 12., and elsewhere. Hence Commentators differ in opinion. The antients took the *great house* to be the *world*, and the words meant to reply to the enquiry. "Why does God permit evil men to be in the world." But this is little agreeable to the context. The best modern Commentators (and even some antients) think that it must mean the *Church*. Yet they are not agreed whether by the *vessels* are meant Christians *in general*, or *Ministers*. The *former* opinion is supported by most Commentators. (See Benson, Rosenm., and Heinr.) The latter, by Mackn., Jaspis, and others; and, indeed, it seems most agreeable to the context: but perhaps it may be *included* in the former.

21. εἰς οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρη ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, &c., "If a man keep himself pure from the contamination of bad men, or false teachers, he will be a vessel pure and fit for the master's use, prepared for every good work," i. e. he will be a faithful Christian and a good teacher. The εἰς πᾶν, &c. is exegetical of εὐχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ. It is unnecessary to add more. The most apposite Classical passage here adduced is

Aristot. Rhet. 2. p. 530. (cited by Heinr.) Τροπὴν ἔχει ἀπὸ σκευῶν καὶ ἀγγείων, μετενεχθὲν ἐπὶ τὰ σεμνοτέρα, ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

22. τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε. The νεωτ. ἐπιθ. are commonly explained of *fornication*, or at least *sensuality*. And Wets. adduces many examples of *cupiditates adolescentiæ*: and he cites Philo 2, 84. μειρακιώδεις ἐπιθυμίας. Yet considering the extreme temperance, nay abstinence, practised by Timothy, and the nature of the antithetical terms, this would be quite foreign to the purpose. Others, as Salmas. and Schliting., interpret it of a *rage for novelty*, such as is often found in young men. But this is destitute of authority, and is little agreeable to the context. Others, as Loesn. and Schleus., interpret it *vehement, heady*. But not to say that the examples they adduce rather relate to νεανικὸς, this is too limited a sense. Upon the whole, I prefer, with Wolf, Doddr., Rosenm., and Heinr., taking μειρακ. in the common and most general signification, *youthful*, thereby understanding all those hot and heady passions which hurry young men into follies and vices. Considering, too, the somewhat mature age (thirty-eight) to which Timothy had now arrived, *cum* (to use the words of Cicero) *adoloscentiæ cupiditates defervissent*, and the nature of the opposite terms, the expression must (I think) be taken of a rash, violent, heady, contentious spirit, pride, ambition, &c. And let it be remarked, that this Epistle, as well as the last, was intended for other ministers as well as Timothy.

Δικαιοσύνην and πίστιν are best explained *virtue* and *fidelity*. The ἀγάπην denotes that *loving disposition* which was to be cultivated towards both Christians and Heathens. For it may also refer to the latter. To these he adds εἰρήνη—καρδίας, which, from ver. 23 & 25., seem mentioned in order to check any spirit of harshness towards some who, though differing in opinion with him and most Christians upon certain questions of no fundamental import-

ance, yet were sincerely pious Christians. Such is admitted to be the sense of the τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν Κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας, with which I would compare Soph. Œd. Col. 4, 87. καλοῦμεν Εὐμενίδας ἐξ εὐμενῶν στέρνων δέχεσθαι τὸν ἱκέτην, where the Schol. explains : μὴ ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς, ἀλλ' ἐνδιαθέτως. See also 1 Sam. 1, 5.

23. τὰς δὲ μαρὰς—μάχας. Compare 1 Tim. 1, 4. & 6, 4. Μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους, contributing nothing to true religion or real happiness. So Theophyl. : αἱ κατὰ φιλοτιμίαν, καὶ οὐ κατὰ τινα χρείαν γινομένην διαλέξεις. Compare Prov. 5, 23. Μάχας, *strifes*. See Tit. 3, 9.

24. δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου—ἀνεξίκακον. The antient and best modern Commentators take the δοῦλ. Κυρίου to mean a *Christian minister*; an appellation often given by the Apostles to themselves and other teachers, and (as I have shown) used even among the Heathens. So Pausan. 10, 32, 8. med.

Οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, “ must not be disputatious and quarrelsome,” either in his public teaching, or private discourse. Compare Tit. 3, 2. and Matt. 12, 19. Διδακτικόν. See the note on 1 Tim. 3, 2. It should seem to have both the active and passive sense, *apt to teach, docibilis*, and *ready to be taught*, as opposed to an overbearing, disputatious spirit : and this is confirmed by the next verse. Ἀνεξίκακον, “ patient of injuries.” So Hierocl., cited by Wets. : πρὸς τὴν ἀρίστην φίλων τήρησιν, καὶ τὴν εὐλογον ἀπόθεσιν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐκ μεταμελείας αὐτῶν μετανάκλησιν πλείστα συμβάλλεται τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀνεξίκακον, καὶ περὶ μηδενὸς πρὸς τοὺς φίλους μικρολογούμενον, μηδὲ ἐξεταστικὸν πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν, ἀλλ' ὅσον οἶοντε ὑπομονητικόν. See Sap. 2, 18. In this context it must denote tolerant of the petulant expressions which may be expected from opposite disputants; agreeably to our Lord's direction, Matt. 20, 26. So Aristides 3, 360. says of Themistocles οὕτω φαῦλος ἦν τοὺς τρόπους (affable and easy) καὶ αὐτόχρημα θεώμενος.

25. ἐν πραότητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους,

“in meekness setting right and instructing the opponents.” Theodoret explains : *φέρων αὐτῶν μακροθύμως τὰς ἀντιθέσεις*. But *ἀντιδιατιθ.* has no particular reference to *oppositions of argument*. It signifies, in a general way, to be *contrary minded*. Thus some MSS. read (e glossâ) *ἀντικειμένους*; as 1 Tim. 5, 4. Compare 1 Tim. 6, 11. It is truly remarked by Theophyl. : *Μετὰ θρασύτητος γὰρ καὶ μάχης οὐκ ἂν τι τῶν χρησίμων δυνηθείη συνιδεῖν ἢ ψυχῇ, διότι τὸν μελλόντά τι τῶν χρησίμων μαθεῖν, χρὴ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἡδέως ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν διδάσκοντα. Πῶς δ' ἂν ἡδέως ἔχοι πρὸς τὸν θρασυνόμενον καὶ ὑβρίζοντα ;*

At *μήποτε δῶ*, &c. there is an ellipsis, like *μήπως*, Rom. 11, 21. “(trying) whether God may give,” &c. *Εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας*, “so that they may acknowledge the truth they now reject.” The Apostle, however, hints at the *danger* of their error by making it need repentance, and that to be effected principally by God. So Acts 11, 18. *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν μετανοίαν ἔδωκεν εἰς ζωὴν*.

26. *καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν—θέλημα*.

This is one of those passages in which it is easy to see the *general* sense, but difficult to determine it *in specie*. Hence the variety of opinions. As to the clause *ἀνανήψωσιν—παγίδος*, that involves no serious difficulty. It is only necessary to consider it as a blending together of two metaphors, and as representing *two* clauses (and so the Syr.); 1st. awaken from the deep sleep, and become sober from the inebriation of diabolical error; 2dly, to rise, disengage oneself from a snare. *Νήφειν* and *ἀνανήφειν* signify, 1st, to awake from a deep sleep; 2dly, to become sober from inebriation; 3dly, to come to a right mind.* But to proceed to the second clause, *ἐξωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνον θέλημα*, here the diversity of opinions appears. The question (I conceive) is, to whom is the pronoun, and consequently the verb *ἐξ.* to be referred? To the more remote antecedent ὁ Θεός, of whom the *ἐξωγ.* must be understood,

* Of these senses examples are adduced by the Commentators, to which I add others of the *third* signification from Liban. Orat. 772. *ἀνανήψας καὶ τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἑαυτὸν συλλεξάμενος*, where there is a similar confusion of *two phrases*. Oraculum Delph. ap. Suid. *Διογενὲς νήψας αἰσχροῦς καταπαύσεται ὀργῆς*. Orac. Syb. p. 33. Galei. K' οὐ θελετ' ἔκνηψαι καὶ σώφρονα πρὸς νοῦν ἐλθεῖν. See also Joseph. 1036, 4. and Cebes p. 16. The Commentators adduce no example of a confusion of the two metaphors; which, however, is not unfrequent in St. Paul. See Heb. 3, 13.

say most antients and many moderns, as H. Steph., Kypke, Michaelis, and Menoch. This interpretation seems to have arisen from their stumbling at the *doctrine* supposed to be involved in the words. So Camerar.: "Dictu sanè est horribile." But I apprehend that as the ἐξ. must have reference to the same noun as παγίδος; and as that is also connected with τοῦ Διαβόλου, so must this. And in this the antients and most eminent moderns, as E. V., Grot., Rosenm., Heinr., Wets., and Jaspis agree. As to the *doctrine*, there is nothing in it more *horrible* than what is elsewhere found in the New Testament, of the influence of the Devil in entangling men in error, keeping them so, and lulling them in the deep sleep of ignorance and security, &c. As to the αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου, as used of the *same*, this is a common variation, on which see Scultet ap. Crit. Sacr.*

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. With this and the following verse compare 1 Tim. c. 4. Ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. So 1 Tim. 4, 1. ἐν ὑστεροῖς καιροῖς, where see the note, to which I add a passage from Æschyl. Ag. 1656. Blomf. ἐν ὑστέραισιν ἡμέραις, where the learned Editor compares Soph. Œd. Col. 641. ἐν ὑστέρω χρόνῳ. He might have added that the phrase often occurs, and in this sense, (namely, *at some future time*,) in Thucyd. Ἐνστήσονται, *will be at hand, arrive*. So 2 Thess. 2, 2. ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου. Sometimes ἀνιστ. is used nearly in the same sense. Χαλεποὶ is explained by Theophyl. πάνυ πονηροί. And he ob-

* I must not omit to mention a method of interpretation, originally proposed by Beza, Hamm, and Wells, and since adopted by Slade and Valpy, by which the αὐτοῦ is referred to διαβόλου, and the ἐκείνου to ὁ Θεός. The passage is thus construed and interpreted: καὶ ἐξωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνον θέλημα, "that they may recover themselves to his will out of the snare of the Devil, who have been taken captive by him." But the scholarship of these Commentators might have shown them that so violent a construction is utterly inadmissible; and their good sense ought to have suggested to them how little necessary it was to resort to any such device.

Wets. ingeniously paraphrases the whole thus: "Capti a servosive ministro Evangelia, Luc. 5, 10. ut servantur et faciant voluntatem Dei. Heb. 13, 21. Ex laqueis diaboli, in quibus perituri erant, extricantur a servo Domini, et transferuntur in alium statum, ut voluntatem Dei deinceps faciant."

serves that this is a popular idiom. The Commentators compare the Latin *gravissima et formidolosa tempora*. See Heinr.

2—3. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, &c.

Here is a συναθροισμός similar to that of Auct. ad Herenn. L. 4. Cupidus, intemperans, impius in parentes, infestus in cognatos, in superiores contumax, in pares fastidiosus, in inferiores crudelis. The Apostle gives the reason why he had called those times χαλεποί. He predicts that Christian virtue will degenerate, and piety be rare; for of *Christians* only he now speaks; and ecclesiastical history shows how speedily the prediction was accomplished. (Grot. and Rosenm.) Vitranga, in a very learned Dissert. Obs. Sacr. L. 4., proves that there was a great alteration in the face of the Christian Church between the time of Nero and Trajan, within which period he apprehends great numbers of professors to have departed from the strictness of Christian morals, as well as the purity of the faith.

Φίλαντοι. This is properly a vox media, but, like our *selfish*, was generally used in *malam partem*, to signify *rapacious, avaricious, and unfeeling*. See Aristot. de Rep. 2, 5. and Nicomach. 9, 8. cited by Wets. To which I add Eurip. Med. 85. ὡς πᾶς τις αὐτὸν τῶν πέλας μᾶλλον φιλεῖ. Joseph. 116, 43. διὰ τὸ φύσει πάντας εἶναι φίλαντους, and 201, 31. ἐδίηλου (scil. ὁ Θεὸς) τὴν ἀνθρωπίνων φύσιν αὐτοφίλαντον οὔσαν.

The φιλάργυροι and ἀλαζόνες require no explanation. (See Schleus.) But as selfishness and avarice are closely united, so, I think, the Apostle meant to join ἀλάζονες with them, in order to form a group; for it seems to denote *ostentation of wealth and grandeur*; and certain it is that the same grovelling spirit that excites men to scrape together riches, heedless of the ruin of others, impels them to gratify their vanity by insulting those who have not equal wealth. So that *ostentation*, whatever shape it may assume, has ever its root in selfishness and avarice. The next word, ὑπερηφάνοι, is nearly allied to ἀλαζ., and seems to form part of the same group.

Βλάσφημοι, “in Deum nempe,” says Rosenm. And so Theoph., who thinks there is a climax, and also Grot. But it would (I think) be nearer the truth to say *in homines*. See Scultet. and 1 Tim. 6, 4.

The next terms, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, and ἄσπονδοι, seem to form another group. For, as Theophyl. observes, he that is disobedient to parents, will be ungrateful to *others*. And he that is such, is ἀνόσιος, because τὴν ὅσιν καὶ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον ἀθετεῖ. He will also be ἄστοργος, for whom will he feel affection for if he rejects his benefactor. He will also be ἄσπονδος, for whom will he keep covenant with, if not his parent and benefactor? But the ἄστοργος seems rather to represent that want of natural affection reciprocally between parents and children, and between near relations, which we find by the Classical writers was so prevalent in that most corrupt age. Josephus often adverts to it; and also Appian and the other Historians; not to mention the Satirists,

as Juveval, and Homer, and Thucyd. 3, 81, gives a specimen of the surpassing brutality in the Peloponnesian war, καὶ γὰρ πάτηρ παῖδα ἀπέκτεινε. I would compare Apoll. Tyæn. Ep. 56. where he says of the Sardinians, ἡμῖν δὲ ἄσπονδα καὶ ἀκήρυκτα καὶ ἀμείλικτα ἔτι τε ἀνίερα (I would read ἀνίαρα) καὶ ἄθεα, τὰ πρὸς γονεῖς πρὸς τέκνα, τὰ πρὸς φίλους συγγενεῖς φυλέτας. When they are said to be *devoid* of this, it is not meant that they never had it, but that they had divested themselves of it, or suppressed it, or act in opposition to it.

Διάβολοι, *calumniators*. For by calumniating the good, they try to bring all down to their own level, as the best medicine for self-reproach.

Ἀκρατεῖς and ἀνήμεροι seem associated. So Doddr.: "intemperate in their pleasures, fierce in their resentments." These terms, however, seem meant to denote that state of *brutishness* in both these respects, which is seen in the fierce tenants of the forest. Ἀφιλάγαθοι is well rendered by Doddr.: "destitute of all love of goodness:" though *this* lingers latest in the heart of all the good feelings implanted there by the Creator. Προδόται. Here there may be a climax; since treachery has ever been considered as one of the most odious of vices. As this term comes after ἀφιλάγαθοι, it may mean "betraying the good," namely, their fellow Christians, as did Judas. So Theophyl. and Œcumen. supply φιλίας καὶ ἐταιρίας.

4. προπετεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι. There is a difficulty respecting these words which the Commentators (prudently enough) forbear to touch on. It is this. In the preceding there is a perceptible *climax*. But here are epithets far *weaker* than the preceding. Now this, I think, may be accounted for by supposing the Apostle intended these words as a *separate clause*, and meant by this *epilogus* to characterize what would be the *leading traits* in *professed Christians* (for that seems to be what is meant by φιλόθεοι), namely, a restless, heady, headlong, rash, reckless, vain, conceited spirit, and an ungovernable thirst for sensual gratifications. Considering the dissoluteness of the manners of that age, the last trait can require no illustration: and as to the second, it is nearly allied to the ἀλαζόνες and ὑπερήφανοι. The *first* is not so easily accounted for. But those who have attentively studied the historical records of those miserable times will admit that this was one of the most distinguishing traits of the people. Many passages proving and illustrating this I remember to have read in Josephus, Appian, Dio Cass. and others. Such

it is that Thucyd., in an inimitably fine description of the manners of the Greeks in the Peloponnesian war, calls the τὸ ἐμπλήκτως ὁξὺ, which the Scholiast explains by *μανιωδῶς*. This and the *τόλμα ἀλόγιστος*, the Historian says, were then alone accounted bravery. Now as human nature (corrupt alas!) is the same in every age, it is no wonder that there should be many striking points of resemblance. Thus Theodoret says, that the description exactly corresponded to the manners of his own age; for, says he, τούτων κακῶν πλήρης ὁ ἡμέτερος βίος, καὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας περικείμενοι πρόσχημα, τὸ τῆς πονηρίας διὰ τῶν ἔργων κατασκευάζομεν εἰδῶλον· ἐρασιχρήματα γὰρ ἀντὶ φιλοθέων γεγόναμεν, καὶ τῶν παθῶν ἀσπαζόμεθα τὴν δουλείαν. The term in question is well explained by Jaspis thus: “ Προπετεῖς sunt homines, qui stimulis affectuum exagitati cæco impetu præcipites ad omnia feruntur, quæ ipsorum pravis blandiantur cupiditatibus et studiis, leges divinas pariter atque humanas susque deque habent et omnia hac de re sibi licita putant. Ab hujus vitii trunco multi rami pullulant.”

With the elegant paronomasia at φιληδ. and φιλόθεοι. Wets. compares Demoph. φιλήδονον καὶ φιλόθεον τὸν αὐτὸν ἀδύνατιν ἐστὶ, and Philo 145, 11. φιλήδονον καὶ φιλοπάθη μάλλον ἢν φιλόθεον.

5. ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡρνημένοι. Μόρφωσις denotes the outward appearance, dress, countenance, manners, voice, &c.; and so it is here taken by the Commentators. But *such* the persons above described would hardly have. It rather stands here for *μορφή*, which term often denotes a *mere form*, as opposed to *reality*, and denotes the external forms of Christianity (such as profession of its doctrines, and occasional attendance on divine worship), as opposed to internal and genuine piety. So Philo. 340, 14. (referred to by Loesn.) καὶ νῦν εἰσι τινες τῶν ἐπιμορφάζοντων τὴν εὐσεbeίαν. Rosenm. compares Tit. 1, 16. Θεὸν ὁμογουσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρναῦνται. And he observes, that the δύναμιν

τῆς εὐσεβείας stands for *real piety*, as being the νεῦρα εὐσεβείας· Ἡγνημένοι, *caring not for, neglecting*.

The Apostle then adds, καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου, where Heinr. renders the καὶ *ergo*. But it may have the usual sense, as referring to the heretical teachers and others, whom the Apostle had admonished Timothy to avoid. The τούτους is for τοιούτους: a use often to be found in Thucyd. and the best Classical writers.

6. ἐκ τούτων—ἀμαρτίαις. The Apostle now enters into a more particular discussion of the above; for ver. 6 and 7 seem parenthetical. Οἱ ἐνδύνοντες τ. ο. This is supposed to be a metaphor taken from *serpents*; as Hom. II. γ. ἔδου. where the Schol. explains ὑπείσῃλθε. So that the term may be best rendered *wind their way into, wriggle themselves into*. Though the E. V. *creep*, and the Version of Doddr. *insinuate* are proper enough. No so that of Mackn., *go*, by which the spirit of the metaphor evaporates. Thus Theophyl. says it marks the τὸ ἀνασχυντὸν, τὸ ἀνελεύθερον, καὶ κολακικὸν, καὶ ἀπάτης γέμον. For an example of ἐνδ. for εἰσδ. Rosenm. refers to a passage of Aristophanes. I would add Athen. 254 D. κόλακές εἰσι—εἰς οὖν ἄκακον ἀνθρώπου τρόπον Εἰσδύς ἕκαστος, ἐσθίει καθίμενος.

6. αἰχμαλωτεύοντες. Rosenm. refers to Rom. 16, 18. But (as Theophyl. observes) this denotes more than ἐξαπατῶντες; the notion of αἰχμαλωτ. (which is similar to our vulgar phrase, *lead by the nose*), supposing subjection for some *end* on the part of the subjector. The diminutive γυναικάρια implies (as often) *contempt*. Σεσωρ. Heinr. compares Is. 1, 4.; and Rosenm., Sallust: “flagitiis coopertis.” Ἀγεσθαι and other words of cognate sense are often used of the being enslaved to vice.

As to the *persons* here meant, I assent to Doddr. that they were not *Jews*, but false *Christian teachers*. Whether the *Romish Monks* of the dark ages be meant (as some say), is uncertain. There are strong points of resemblance. And yet, long before the middle ages, we find this adverted to. So Irenæus ap Wets.: μάλιστα περὶ γυναικας ἀσχολεῖται, καὶ τοῦτον τὰς εὐπαρύφους καὶ περιπορφύρους καὶ πλου-

σιωτάρους. The same things, too, are proved of the *Pharisees*. Thus Joseph. 753, 35. καὶ γὰρ ἦν μόνον τι Ἰουδαίων (scil. Pharisei) ἐπ' ἀκρίβωσι μέγα φρονούν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου· οἷς, χαίρειν τὸ Θεῖον πρόστοι οὐ μένων, ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνίτις. See also 1003, 36. Indeed this is true of *every* age. So Less in a Dissert. on this passage, cited by Heinr.: "Veteratores istius modi plerumque varium et mutabile semper fœminam adoriri: hujus conscientiã pro lubitu imperare: ejusque ope familias regere integrasque respublicas, historia docet æquè ac nostri temporis experientia." And Jerome (cited by Menoch. and Tiren.) says that all heresies have begun to be propagated by means of women. Certainly the words have been verified of religionists whose opinions differed in toto from those of the Romanists.

6. ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις. The ἐπιθυμίαι are usually interpreted *vices* and sins of every kind, especially *carnal lusts*, in which Less and Heinr. think these false teachers indulged them, in order to make them subservient to their own purposes of *every* kind. But perhaps this may be more than the Apostle meant; since it is little agreeable to what follows. It rather seems to mean *strong passions* and *feelings*. Now it is well known how the exquisite sensibility of the fairer (and I may add *better*) sex has been, in every age, artfully worked upon by such hypocrites.

7. πάντοτε μαυθάνοντα—δυνάμενα. If the sense assigned to the foregoing be true, this admit of easy explanation. For by such weak persons, and from such ill informed and crafty teachers *truth* could never be attained; much less that *practical use* of it which is of most importance. Heinr. (probably enough) thinks this applies chiefly to rich elderly women, who, after having past a life of sin, wished to attain something that should allay the stings of conscience, and reconcile them to themselves.

8. ὃν τρόπον—Μωϋσεϊ. These were Egyptian magicians who, as we learn from the Rabbinical writings (from whence St. Paul derived the intelligence) and some Gentile philosophers, Numinus, Archaus, and Pliny, were priests at Memphis, and were among those who opposed their magic tricks to the

miracles of Moses. Ἀνθρώποι—πίστιν. Compare 1 Tim. 6, 5.

9. ἀλλ' οὐ προκόψουσιν—ἐγένετο. So supra, 2, 16. ἐπὶ πλείον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας. The phrases are the same, though not the persons. Ἐπὶ πλείον, "very far." So Theodoret: μέχρι πολλοῦ. Ἀνοία, "ignorance and imposture." See 1 Tim. 1, 13.

10. σὺ δὲ—ὑπομονῇ. The connection is obscure, and has been variously traced. The most natural mode may be (with Heinr.) to take the δὲ as an *adversative*; q. d. "Thou (on the contrary)," &c. The Apostle, however, makes this eulogium introductory to an admonition to constancy and greater zeal in defence of religion; q. d. "Thou who hast fully known—do thou continue," &c. (ver. 14.) On παρακ. see the note on 1 Tim. 4, 6. The μου (as Heinr. observes, is emphatic. Ἀγωγή, *manner of life*, ἀναστροφῇ; a signification common in the Classical writers. Προθέσει *scope and purpose*. So the Vulg. *propositum*; and Theophyl., παραστήματι τῆς ψυχῆς. Wets. compares Plin. Pan. Traj. 91. ita congruens tenor vitæ, ita una eademque ratio propositi postulabat. Πίστει, *sincerity and fidelity*. Ἀγάπη, *love to Christians*, nay, even *Pagans*. The terms μακροθυμία and ὑπομονῇ, are by Heinr. united; and ἀγάπη being placed between, is interpreted of *love to persecutors*. But this is harsh. It should rather seem that μακροθ. refers to what he is to bear with from his *brethren* (and so, I find, Theophyl.); ὑπομονῇ, to the persecution to be endured from Jews and Pagans: on which latter particular he enlarges in the next verse.

11. τοῖς διωγμοῖς, τοῖς παθήμασιν. These words are put in apposition, and require something to be supplied; q. d. "(which I was called upon to endure in) the persecutions," &c. See Acts 13, 14, 45, & 50. 19, 1—6. Καὶ, *and yet*.

12. καὶ πάντες δὲ—διωχθήσονται. "(Nay) and *all*," &c. Εἰ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν' is for οἱ εὐσεβοῦντες. And εὐσ. ζῆν' ἐν X. I. signifies, "live with piety suitable

to the Christian faith, holily, righteously, and godly." I would compare Nicephorus, 46 Α. τοὺς κατὰ Θεὸν ζῆν αἰρουμένους. Most recent Commentators, as Less, Heinr. &c., think the διωχθήσ. is solely to be interpreted of those times of bitter persecution when the "*little flock*" was surrounded with countless multitudes of Jews and Gentiles. But this is an unwarrantable refinement; since it is, more or less, true of every age, especially when the good and evil principles are brought into collision with each other; the corruption of our nature always supplying *matter*. Besides, as Theophyl. observes, by the διωγμ. may be included θλίψεις and ἰδύναις, which the righteous are called upon to bear, πειρατήριον γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ βίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, κατὰ τὸν Ἰωβ, καὶ ὁ τὴν στένην ὁδεύων, ἐξ ἀνάγκης θλίβεται.

13. πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι—πλανώμενοι. Γόης, like πλάνος and ἀπατεῶν, signifies a *juggler*, or, in a general way, an *impostor* or deceiver: a fit appellation for the false teachers just mentioned. Προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, "they will go from bad to worse;" since *nemo repente fit turpissimus*. Πλανῶντες κ. π. "deceiving their devotees, and being themselves deceived by other teachers whom they follow." So most Commentators (as Rosenm.) explain. But there is something unsatisfactory in the latter part of this exposition. The scope of the Apostle (which has been little attended to) is this. In the former verse he speaks for the *warning* and, in some measure, the *comfort* of all true Christians of all ages. In the present verse he further speaks for their *comfort*, by checking that spirit of *murmuring*, which even the righteous (as David) are too apt to fall into, on comparing their own afflictions with the seeming happiness of the wicked. To which the answer is, that this world is a scene of trial; and, moreover, that the wicked do in reality *deceive themselves*, when they deceive others, and will *suffer* what they *inflict*. This view of the sense is supported by the

authority of Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen., and has been adopted by Heinr.

There is a neat paronomasia in *πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι*, of which Wets. adduces several examples in *decipere* and *decipi*. Rosenm. compares Julian: *ἡπατημένος ἀπατᾷ*. To which I add Liban. Ep. 1182. *ἡπατήμενος αὐτὸς ἐξάπατα*, and Porph. in Vita Plohn. c. 15. *πολλοὺς ἐξήπάταν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡπατήμενοι*. But this paronomasia was aimed at in other verbs as well as *ἀπατ*.

14. *σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστῶθης*. The Apostle follows up his censure of the false teachers by a noble *epilogus*, ver. 14.—fin. Compare 1 Tim. 4, 16. *Δὲ, on the contrary*. Grot. observes, that *καὶ ἐπιστῶθης* is for *ἐπιστ.*, by syllepsis. It is well rendered by Heinr.: “quæ certissimè et in firmam tuam persuasionem edoctus es.” *Ἐπιστ.* is a stronger term than *ἔμαθες*. So Hesych.: *ἐπληρωφορήθη*. And Theophyl. explains it: *μετὰ πληροφορίας ἔμαθες*. And he observes that there were two reasons given why he should hold them firmly. 1. As having learned them from Paul, nay (through his medium), from Christ himself. 2. That they were not to him a thing of yesterday, but learned by him from a child, and rooted in him. Rosenm. thinks the Apostle means to allude to the communicating the pure milk of the word, without admixtures of Gentile philosophy, or Jewish superstition: and Heinr., to his *disinterestedness*. But it should rather seem that he refers to himself as a *divine legate*, and endued with all the qualifications fitted for imparting religious knowledge.

15. *καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας*. There is here (I think) no *anacoluthon*, as some suppose. The *εἰδως* must be repeated, but with a slight accommodation of sense, namely, *mindful*. *Ἰερὰ γράμματα*, “the Scriptures of the Old Testament.” By this and similar names they are called by Joseph., Philo, and others. See the note on Joh. 7, 15. and Wets. in loc. *Ἀπὸ βρέφους*, “from a boy.” So *ἐκ*

παιδὸς and other phrases. That this instruction commenced at a very early period, nay, even at the age of five, we learn from the authority of Joseph., Philo, and the Rabbins. Σοφίσαι □□□, *instruct*. So Schol. on Aristoph. Nub. 330. (cited by Wets.) σοφιστάς τοὺς διδασκάλους νόει ὡς τοὺς ἄλλους σοφίζοντας. Εἰς σωτηρίαν, "i. e. (says Theophyl.) not in deceits, sophisms, and logomachias, which would be εἰς ἀπώλειαν." The words διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἐν Χ. Ι. must be closely connected with σωτηρίαν. So Theophyl. : ποῖαν; οὐ τὴν δι' ἔργων, οὐ τὴν διὰ λόγων, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Ι. Χ. Ὁδηγοῦσι γὰρ αἱ ἅγαι γραφαὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι Χριστῷ, σωτηρίαν περιποιοῦντι. Wets. paraphrases thus: "Libros V. T. nosti, qui te possunt ducere ad salutem, si jungas doctrinam Christi, ad quam prophetiæ in illis contentæ te ducunt." That is, "they instruct in the business of salvation to be *effected* by faith in Christ," i. e. by the Christian religion. For, as Rosenm. observes, the prophecies and the whole economy of the Old Testament tend to Christ, whom they prove to have been Jesus; the end of the law is Christ, the scope and sum of Scripture: wherefore our Lord and the Apostles often show the close connection of the new religion with the Old Testament. See Joh. 5, 39. Acts 17, 2 & 3. 18, 28. 28, 33. Their *other uses* are touched on in the next verse.

16. πᾶσα γραφὴ—δικαιοσύνη.

On the *construction*, and, in some degree, the *sense* of these words, there has been no little difference of opinion. That an ἔστι must be supplied, is obvious; but on the *place* where it is to be introduced interpreters are not agreed. The antients almost universally, and the moderns up to the time of Camerar. and Grot., and most since, insert it between γραφὴ and θεόπνευστός. This, however, did not satisfy even some antients, who (as I find from Theophyl.) objected, "What, is *all* Scripture, that of the Greek Classics too, divinely inspired? No." To make the sense complete, they therefore put a comma after θεόπν. Thus the sense will be: "All inspired Scripture is also profitable." And this is adopted by Theodoret, who remarks: Τῷ διορισμῷ χρησάμενος ἀπέκρινε τὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας συγγράμματα. Theophyl., however, acutely removes the objection thus: "Εδει δὲ αὐτοὺς συνειδεῖν, ὅτι εἰπὼν ἀνωτέρω, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, λέγει νῦν, ὅτι πᾶσα γράφη ποία;

περὶ ἧς διελέγετο, περὶ ἧς εἶπεν, ὅτι ἱερά· πᾶσα οὖν ἡ τοιαύτη, θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, πρὸς πάντα, &c. Yet all the most eminent critics, from Camer. down to Heinr. and Jaspis, adopt the construction of Theodoret, which is also supported by the authority of the Syr. and Vulg. (and also by the Pseudo Phocylid.): τῆς δὲ θεοπνεύστου σοφίας λόγος ἐστὶν ἄριστος. But though the sense may not be materially different, yet I see not how the καὶ will permit this: for to take it with Camerar., as put αἰτητικῶς, is very harsh. As a proof of which the καὶ is omitted by Clem. Alex., Theod. Mops., and other Fathers (see Griesb.), who adopt the interpretation in question. And “to make surety more sure,” they bring in οὔσα. But this putting in and putting out, without the authority of a single MS. (for as to *Versions*, they are no evidence) is most unwarrantable. It has been shown by Wolf, Gusset, and others ap. Wolf, that the καὶ admits of no tolerable exposition, except upon the common interpretation, which was satisfactorily established by Athanasius and Chrysostom; and in this, as the construction requires it, the context admits it, and the sense it yields is more determinate (for the other is but a left-handed mode), I must finally acquiesce.

On the exact sense in which the *inspiration* is to be understood this is no fit place to treat. Suffice it to say, that without contending for the *plenary* inspiration of every portion of the Old Testament (i. e. to the suggestion of the thoughts and words), yet we must suppose that *such* a degree of divine aid was afforded, as was necessary to accomplish the purposes intended, and secure the writer from any error of consequence: otherwise it could not be depended on for the purposes here suggested.

The διδασκαλίαν and ἐλεγχον are considered by Heinr. as forming an hendiadis. But they are better kept separately; the former signifying, “teaching us the truth, true religion;” the latter, “conviction of the opposite error.” So Theophyl.: διδάσκουσα εἴτι δεῖ μαθεῖν, καὶ εἰ ἐλέγξει δεῖ τὰ ψεύδη. The πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν signifies, “for reformation of irregularities in practice.” So Polyb. p. 50. (cited by Wets.) πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπων βίου. With respect to the πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, it is considered by Theophyl. and Heinr. as synonymous with ἐπανορθ. But this is destroying the antithesis. For as πρὸς διδασκ. and πρὸς ἐλεγχον are opposed, so, I conceive, are πρὸς ἐπανορθ. and πρὸς παιδ.; the former teaching them how to “cease to do evil,” the latter how to “learn to do well;” and having begun with the former, they may proceed with the latter, “going on from strength to strength,” &c.

17. ἵνα ἄρτιος—ἐξηρτισμένος, “So that (by such aids) the man of God, the teacher of the Gospel (as 1 Tim. 6, 11.), may be complete.” So Etymol. (cited by Wets.): ἄρτως σημαίνει τὸν ὑγιῆ καὶ πεπληρωμένον. The words following, πρὸς—ἐξήρτ. are exegetical of ἄρτιος. The sense is: “thoroughly furnished with

all that is necessary for his Evangelical office." So *κατηρτισμένος*, in Luke 6, 40. And in this sense the word often occurs in Thucyd. As to the reading *ἐξηρτ.*, it is *ex emendatione*. It is plain that a knowledge of the doctrines of the Christian revelation is *supposed*, as well as that of the Old Testament; otherwise no Christian can be *ἄρτιος*: and indeed this is hinted at *supra* ver. 15. By *πάν ἔργον ἀγαθόν* is meant every duty of a good minister.

CHAP. IV.

VER. 1. On this statement of the means necessary for making the man of God or teacher complete for his good work, the Apostle engrafts an earnest exhortation to the perpetual and zealous *use* of them. It is truly observed by Heinr.: "Si in quo alio loco, ita profectò in hoc cernitur quàm apertissimè, quàm intimo ex animi integerrimi et religionis veræ studiosissimi recessu hæc promanaverint."

Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνόπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, "I conjure and charge thee." See 1 Tim. 5, 21. *Here*, however, the clause *τοῦ μέλλοντος—αὐτοῦ* is added, in order not merely to *express the majesty* of Christ (as Rosenm. says), but also to suggest the strict and solemn *account* which Timothy must have then to give of his stewardship, and withal, by the *τὴν βασιλείαν*, the glorious reward of fidelity. For I cannot agree with Rosenm. and Heinr., who (after the Syr.) suppose an hendiadis at *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφανείαν* and *καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ*. The latter clause must be kept separate; and the sense is simply, "when he will establish his kingdom," i. e. (as Benson well explains) his kingdom of glory, when all things shall be subjected to God, even the Father, and which will commence from the day of judgment. His kingdom does indeed at present exist: but that is his *mediatorial* one, meant to bring all things in subjection to his Father.

Κατὰ, *at* ; a somewhat rare sense, yet found in the Classical writers.

2. κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, “Preach therefore the Gospel (constantly and firmly).” This exhortation the timidity of Timothy needed. The Apostle now shows *how* it must be preached. Ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως, “Ply your work vigorously.” For ἐφιστ. is properly used of sedulous labour, by which we *incumbimus*. See Raphael in loc. With respect to εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως (which form a neat *paranomasia* and perhaps proverbial expression, denoting παντὶ τρόπῳ, of which the Commentators adduce some examples), it is agreed by the best antient and modern Commentators, that they must be understood of *Timothy*, not of the *people*. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): μὴ ἔστασοι καιρὸς ὠρισμένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐκαίρως, τουτέστιν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ἐν ἀδείᾳ, καὶ ἐπ’ ἐκκλησίας ὧν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκαίρως, τουτέστιν, ἐν κινδύνοις ὧν, καὶ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, λάλει καὶ κήρυττε. See also Benson and Heinr. Ἀκαίρως may also signify, “even when it is inconvenient to *yourself*.” For opportunity, or the contrary, as regards *his people*, no prudent pastor will overlook. Yet he will not fail to do his duty, even when it may be thought by some done ἀκαίρως. So Seneca, Ep. 121. Virtutes exhortabor, et vitia converberabo; licet aliquis nimium immoderatumque in hac parte me judicet, non desistam.

2. ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον. Benson renders this: “confute the erroneous, reprove the wicked.” But the ἐλ. rather means, *convict, convince them of sin, smite their consciences*. It is a stronger term than ἐπιτιμ., and may denote *open objurgation*; the other, *private reproof*. Παρακάλεσον. As the ἐλ. and ἐπιτ. regard the *erring*, so this refers to those who have *learnt to do well*, and are faithfully striving to perform their duty. These, then, he is to *exhort to continue* in the right path. The next words show the *mode* in which this is to be done, where I cannot, with Heinr., take διδασχῇ to mean the *studium* alios docendi, but in the

usual sense of *instruction*. Rosenm. considers the words μακροθυμία καὶ διδαχῇ as an hendiadis for ἐν πάσῃ διδασκάλῃ μακροθύμῳ. But this is unnecessary. It should seem that καὶ διδαχῇ is put for διδάξον. And so (I think) the antients took it. The ἐν μακροθυμία is, by the antients and most moderns, referred to *all* the preceding. And Benson remarks that St. Paul never mentions *patience* when he puts *Titus* on reproving. Nor can I think that he does so with respect to *Timothy*; since there seems something incongruous. The expression should seem to be meant only for the duty immediately preceding, namely, *exhortation*: and even Theophyl. acknowledges that it is there by far the most requisite. Now as καὶ διδαχῇ is put for καὶ διδάξον, so the ἐν μακροθυμία may refer to that also; and assuredly there is *need* enough of patience in the exercise of both these duties; and if the Apostle does not mention μακροθυμία in a similar exhortation to *Titus*, it might be from the difference in temper of the two, or difference in circumstances, or both.

Rosenm. compares Plut. de Liberor. educ. (speaking of judicious parents): διδάσκοντας, ἀπειλῶντας, δεομένους, συμβουλευοντας. Seneca 1, 14. de Irâ: Corrigendus est qui peccat, et admonitione, et vi, et molliter, et asperè. Gell. 5, 1. (of a philosopher): Quum hortatur, monet, suadet, objurgat.

3. ἔσται γὰρ—ἀνέξονται. Whitby and Benson connect thus: "Be instant now, and speedily; for the time will come," &c. So Theophyl.: ὥστε πρὶν ἢ ἐτραχηλισθῆναι αὐτοὺς προκατέλαβε. I should prefer the following mode: "And need enough is there of these other ministerial qualifications; for," &c.

3. ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς. The context requires us to take this of time which should, ere long, arrive (another hint, Benson observes, of the introduction of the grand apostacy). Wets. compares the *tempus veniet* or *erit* of Virgil.

3. ὑγιαίνουσιν διδασκαλίᾳς. See 1 Tim. 1, 10. and 2 Tim. 1, 13. Οὐκ ἀνέξονται, "will not endure."

Benson here remarks that that is sound doctrine which promotes a holy life. I can *more* readily accede to his following position, that it is the love of vice which renders men averse to sound doctrine, and puts them upon following such teachers as will gratify their humours and inclinations; and please their ears or fancies, without attacking and condemning their opinions or their vices. Mackn. illustrates the grand apostacy, especially as it relates to *Popery*. The generality of people (he says) nauseated the wholesome doctrines of true piety and sound morality, and only heeded the superstitions which encouraged them in their sins. Rosenm. compares Isocrat. ad Demonic. : τοὺς πλείστους εὐρῆσομεν, ὥσπερ τῶν σιτίων, τοῖς ἡδίστοις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὑγιαינוτάτοις χαίροντας.

3. κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς ἰδίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύουσιν.

Commentators are not agreed whether the clause κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας is to be taken with ἐπισωρ., or with διδασκάλους. The latter opinion is supported by the antients, and, of the moderns, by Est., Doddr., Benson, and most recent Commentators, as Rosenm. and Heinr. The *former* method is adopted by almost all the early moderns, and seems to yield a sense more natural and agreeable to the context. The other requires a harsh transposition, and also the subaudition of some participle; whereas, on the *former* mode of interpretation, the same sense is attained, but in a less violent way. With respect to ἐπιθυμ., it may be taken as *supra*, 3, 6., where see the note. The sense is: "consulting only their own passions, whims, and fancies."

The ἐπισωρεύουσιν hints (Heinr. observes) that the *number* would be considered more than the *merit*. It is (I think) more correct to say that it implies *contempt*, and supposes that there will be no want of persons *istius farinae*.*

The following, κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν, is exegetical of the ἐπιθυμίας. It is an elegant phrase, of which Wets. adduces several examples, to which I add a passage more important than them all,

* It is strange that the Commentators, who so minutely compare these marks of the apostacy with the *Popish corruptions*, should have failed to notice how strong a resemblance the *heaps of teachers* here mentioned bear to the actual state of the Romish Hierarchy, which in Spain, Portugal, &c. is far more numerous than the spiritual wants of the people can possibly require, or, indeed, is consistent with pure morals.

and which, as treating of Christian teachers, and coming from the Emperor Julian after the apostacy had commenced, is very curious. Epist. p. 333. Edit. Princ. δυνάμενοι τὰς ἀκοὰς ὑμῶν κνηστιῶσαι—ικάνως παρημυθήσασθαι. See also, on this subject, some beautiful reflections of Philo Jud. 170 D. 207 & 406 B. The sense is plainly this: “seeking to have their ears tickled with something, especially addressed to the passions, flattering their virtues, dealing gently with their vices, and thus lulling them in a fond security.”

4. καὶ ἀπὸ—ἐκτραπήσονται. The ἀκοὴν is here again put for the *ears*; as Luke 7, 1. and Acts 17, 29. The *sentiment* here is nearly the same with that of the preceding τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται. Ἐπὶ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται, “they will turn to fables.” The term *μυθος* is happily introduced; since it hints both at the false nature of the doctrines, and the mythic, story-telling, trifling nature of the discourses; such being ever employed *ad captandum*.* So Isocrat. (cited by Rosenm.): δεῖ τοὺς βουλομένους ἢ ποιεῖν ἢ γράφειν τι κεχαρισμένον τοῖς πολλοῖς, μὴ τοὺς ὠφελιμωτάτους τῶν λόγων ζητεῖν ἀλλὰ τοὺς μυθωδεσπάτους. And I would compare a sentiment of the Prince of Historians, 1, 21. ὡς λογογράφοι ξυνέθεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγότερον τῇ ἀκρόασει ἢ ἀληθέστερον, ὄντα ἀνεξέλεγκτα καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ χρόνου αὐτῶν ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνευικηκότα.† See also Pind. Olymp. 1. 44, 8.

It is remarkable the Commentators should not have compared this point of similarity with the method ever pursued by the *mendicant* Friars, at least of the Romish Church; though not *confined* to them. Of this we have an illustrious example in the celebrated Portuguese preacher, Vieira. Nay, from this mark of the apostacy even the *Protestant Church* would not be found free. *Intra Iliacos muros peccatur et extra!*

* In the same manner, the word was plainly taken by Theodoret, who observes: τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ μυθώδη παιδεύματα, τέρψιν οὐκ ὄνησιν ἔχοντα.

† It is singular that the Editors should not have seen that this stroke (the ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες) is levelled against the good old story-teller of Halicarnassus, who, however, after all, delights our youth, and instructs our age, and is the last work of the kind we lay by.

5. σὺ δὲ νῆφε—πληροφόρησον. The whole passage, in which from ch. 2, 14. he had exhorted Timothy to avoid the pernicious examples of his age, Apostle concludes with proposing to him his own example. (Heinr.)

On νῆφε see 1 Thess. 5, 6. and the note. And on κακοπ. see 2, 3. and the note. Εὐαγγελιστοῦ. See Acts 21, 8. and Eph. 4, 11. and the note. Heinr. says, that Euseb. H. E. 5, 9. calls such διακόνοι Ἀποστόλων, *Missionaries*. Thus there is added τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, where διακ. signifies an *Ecclesiastical ministry*; and πληροφορ. is a stronger term than πλήρωσον, and signifies *fully accomplish*.

6. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι. The ἐγὼ is emphatical, as was the σὺ in the last verse; q. d. “Do *you* fully perform your evangelical duties; nor expect any further assistance and exhortations from me; *for* I (on my part) am already *poured upon*.” Such is the literal sense of σπένδομαι; a figurative expression for ἐπιθανάτιος εἶμι; since the σπονδὴ was poured out on the victim just before the fatal blow. I would compare Eurip. Orest. 1237. Δακρύοις κατασπένδω σ’. ΗΛ. ἐγὼ δ’ οἴκτοισί γε. This, then, designates his belief that a violent death was close at hand, which we know did really happen to him a very short time afterwards; and therefore the above interpretation must be thought very striking, and probably true. There is, however, some difference of opinion on the force of the metaphor. Some think it signifies: “I am being poured out unto God as a libation, to seal my ministry with my blood.” So Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen. Most recent Commentators think that it only signifies, “My strength is wholly dissolved and gone;” as Ps. 22, 15. “I am poured out like water.” And they refer to Phil. 2, 17. But the passage of Phil. is not quite apposite; and the sense assigned is not so natural.

The words following are exegetical, “The time of my dissolution or departure is at hand.”

7. This image the Apostle follows up with ano-

ther, derived (as often) *e re agonisticâ*; on which see the note on 1 Tim. 6, 12. Ἀγωνίζεσθαι is a deponent; and in the preterite it signifies to accomplish any combat. Ἀγωνίζεσθαι τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα, *to fight the glorious fight*, seems to have been a proverbial phrase for obtaining the victory and gaining a prize.* On τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα see Acts 20, 24. Τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα. Most Commentators, antient and modern, explain τὴν πίστιν, *the Christian religion*. Most recent ones, *fidelity*; which indeed seems a preferable sense, and *includes* the other; q. d. “I have kept my pledged faith to further the Christian religion.” This, too, is supported by the usage of the Classical writers, from whom Wets. adduces examples, which, in a *doubtful* case, should decide the point. See also 1 Tim. 5, 12.

8. λοιπὸν, ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος. See 1 Thess. 2, 19. and Col. 1, 5. Crowns and all sorts of prizes held forth to conquerors were said ἀποκεῖσθαι, because they were set apart as their due, and ready for them. So Demophilus Similit. p. 615. (cited by Wets.) τοῖς μὲν σταδιοδρομοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ τέρματι τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς νίκης—ἀπόκειται: and Hesych.: ἀπόκειται, ἐτοίμασται. I add Suid.: στεφανικὸν τέλεσμα· and Pind. Olymp. 10, 9. ἀφθονότατος δ' αἶνος Ὀλυμπιανίκαῖς Οὗτος ἄγκειται (for ἀνάκειται). With the ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος I would compare Plut. Symp. L. 3, 2, 1. στέφανος εὐσεβείας. See the note on Gal. 1, 15. Ἀποδώσει, “will give a remuneration.” So Matt. 6, 4, 16, 27. and infra 14. and elsewhere. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ, i. e. the day of judgment. See the note on 1, 12. Ὁ δίκαιος κριτὴς. Rosenm.

* Among the passages cited by Wets. is Thucyd. 7, 59. ἐνόμισαν καλὸν ἀγῶνα σφισιν εἶναι ἐπὶ τῇ γεγενημένῃ νίκῃ τῆς ναυμαχίας, ἔλαιν τε τὸ στρατόπεδον ἅπαν τῶν Ἀθηναίων. But this (as I shall elsewhere show) is of a different nature. More apposite is Eurip. Alc. 648. καίτοι καλὸν γ' ἀντόνδ' ἀγῶν ἡγωνίσω, τοῦ σοῦ πρὸ παιδὸς κατθανῶν. Heinr. compares Herm. Trismeg. L. 4. ἡ ψυχὴ τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγῶνα ἡγωνισμένη. I add Philo 69 ε. καλὸν δρόμον, καὶ πάντων ἀριστὸν ἀγώνισμα τοῦτο νικῶν.

regards the δικ. as emphatical; q. d. “*the just Judge*, who does nothing like frail mortals, through lucre, or favour to the undeserving.” The expression τοῖς ἡγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ designates those who have been faithful worshippers of God, who have well discharged their duties towards him and towards their fellow-creature, and have thence *reason* to feel pleasure at the thought of their Lord’s advent. The *past* tense is used (as Rosenm. remarks) with reference to the *time* of the judgment; q. d. “to those who *shall* have loved and hailed his advent.” This is not said in the spirit of boasting, but to excite Timothy and others to aim at so glorious a prize, and accustom themselves to look forward with joy to the coming of the Lord. There is something very touching in the picture drawn of himself from ver. 6—fin. It is, as far as I know, unparalleled, except in the great Archetype of all perfection, whom he copied. There is, however, some faint resemblance of it in Xenophon’s beautiful description of the manner in which Socrates spent the few hours previous to laying down his life as a martyr in the cause of truth and virtue.

10. δῆμας γὰρ με ἐγκατέλιπεν, ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα, q. d. “For (I need some assistance), Demas having forsaken me.” He, it seems, through cowardice, deserted him, and, through wordly-mindedness, preferred temporal advantage to the assisting the Apostle and furthering the Gospel. For such seems to be meant by ἀγαπ. τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα. And ἀγαπᾶν often signifies to love *in preference*, to *prefer*. Rosenm. compares the ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις in 2 Tim. 2, 2.; and thinks that as this Demas was going to Thessalonica, he had entered into some commercial business. Which, and other speculations, I leave *in medio*, referring the reader to Benson, &c.

Crescens is thought to have been one of Cæsar’s household (see Phil. 4, 22.); perhaps the freedman mentioned by Tacit. Hist. 1. What Titus’s business

was in Dalmatia we are not told. Probably that of the Gospel; for scarcely any thing else would have induced him to leave the Apostle at so critical a time.

11. Λουκᾶς—διακονίαν. Luke, after another journey, which he has described at the end of the Acts, remained in Italy with Paul. See Col. 4, 14. Of *Mark* it is said ἐστὶ μοι εὐχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν, i. e. "he is and will be useful to me in the ministry," namely, as the best Commentators are agreed, *of the Gospel*; and this, they conjecture, by his knowledge of the Latin tongue. That, too, would make him useful in many ways. This is (as Benson remarks) a proof that Paul and Mark were reconciled after the slight difference recorded at Acts 15, 38 and 39. Yet some think the Mark here mentioned is not the same.

12. τυχικὸν δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἐφεσον. This person, a native of Proconsular Asia (Acts 20, 4.) was a frequent companion of Paul. See Tit. 3, 13. Eph. 6, 21. Col. 4, 7. The Apostle had doubtless sent Tychichus to Ephesus, in order to supply Timothy's place; so that there might be nothing to prevent his coming.

13. τὸν φαινόλην. There are few points in the New Testament more unsettled than the true reading and right interpretation of this word. It is written φαιλώνης, φελώνη, φελόνη, φελώνης, and φαινόλης. Probably the first and last reading are the most correct: for φαινόλης is justly thought to be the same with the Latin *pænula*, and in the other there is only a metathesis. The *etymology* is too uncertain to be any guide to the *sense*. There are (and were among the antients) two opinions: 1. that of most Commentators, as Luther, Grot. Bartholin, Ferrarius (who wrote on the *dress of the antients*), and Stosch de Pallio, suppose it to have been a *rough great coat*, or *wrapper*, which Schoettg. says, was called by the Jews פליין. That of some antients, the Syr., Masius in a Dissertation on this subject,

Moldehauer, and others, and especially the learned Schleus. (to whom I am indebted for much of the foregoing detail), who suppose it to have been a *book-case*, γλωσσόκομον, or *capsula*. And this is supported by Hesych., Abberti Gloss. Bibl. Cocol., and Zonar. Lex. 1801. See also Suic. Thess. 2, 1422.; Ducang. Gloss., and the Commentators or Pollux 729., and especially the Crit. Sacr., Pole's Syn., and Wolf's Curæ. Perhaps it was like what our old authors call a *cloak-bag*, or *portmanteau*; and in this Paul had probably left the books and parchments, since it would be very fit for such a purpose. What was the nature of the MSS. and what were the *books*, which might be very *small* and *unbound*, we are left in the dark; and on a point so uncertain I shall forbear to hazard any opinion.

14. Ἀλέξανδρος—ἐνεδείξατο. The person mentioned at Acts 19, 33. and 1 Tim. 1, 20. the brasier. Though some doubt whether he was the same. Ἐνεδείξατο is for ἐποιήσατο; yet it is a more expressive term. So Gen. 50, 15 and 17. ὅτι πονηρὰ σοι ἐνεδείξατο. Hymn. 3 Puer. κακὰ ἐνδεικνυμένη, and elsewhere. (See Schleus. Lex. V. T.) Were it not for this, I should have suspected it to be a *Latinism*; for *exhibere* is sometimes used for *patrare* and *facere*.

At the imprecation (as it is *called*) in ἀποδώῃ αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, unbelievers find much to censure: and the defence made by Commentators has not been so satisfactory as might be wished, especially that of Heinr. and others. Rosenm. and Jaspis urge that the Apostle justly imprecated him, as an enemy of God and the Gospel, and for his incorrigible malice: which, Jaspis observes, is one, though not the only, cause of the imprecations in the Psalms. And they might have added, that the man was in all probability an *apostate*. At the same time I cannot but agree with the antients, and several eminent moderns, that there is here, properly speaking, no *imprecation*, but rather a *prediction*, or a *wish* for his condign punishment, i. e. that the righ-

teous God and Judge will treat him as he deserves. As to the reading ἀποδώσει, it is a *paradiorthosis*.

Of this man the Apostle bids Timothy *beware*, (q. d. “Hic niger est, hunc tu Romane caveto”), because, he adds, λίαν ἀνθέστηκε τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις, which some interpret of opposing and replying to his *defence*; most, however, of his opposing the *doctrine* of Paul. It may mean even the *Gospel itself*.

16. ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου ἀπολογία—ἐγκατέλιπον. On the exact nature of this ἀπολογία, and in what sense it is to be understood, Commentators are not agreed. (See Pole’s Syn., Wolf, Benson, and Heinr. Proleg.) It is generally supposed to mean the *time* of his first imprisonment, during which he had gone through an examination, and been allowed a *hearing*; as when it was said, “Paul, thou art permitted to speak for thyself.” And so Acts 22, 1. ἠκούσατε μου ἀπολογίας. Compare 1 Pet. 3, 15.* During the *second* ἀπολογία or confinement, they say, this Epistle was written. And, as we learn from Ecclesiastical History, this second hearing or trial turned out very different; since the brutal Emperor, in a rage (as Chrys. tells us) at his conversion of the royal cup-bearer, had him beheaded.

Συμπαρεγένετο is thought to refer to the custom of the friends or patrons of any person going with him as advocates and pleaders. So Donatus ad Terent. (cited by Rosenm.): “Adesse dicuntur amici aut advocati in foro periclitantibus.”

16. μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθεῖν, “I wish and pray God it may not be imputed to them.” So Rom. 5, 8. ὃ οὐ μὴ λογίσχεται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. Job. 34, 17. τοῦτο μοι ἄρα ἀνομία ἢ μεγίστη λογισθεῖν. Schol. on Eurip. Med. 156. ἐκείνω τόδε τὸ ἁμάρτημα μὴ λογίζου. Though, as Theophyl. remarks, it was a great sin worthy to be imputed. This benevolent prayer, so much in ac-

* Benson, however, sees no reason for supposing that this apology was made during the Apostle’s first confinement at Rome: but, from verses 6, 7, 8, 17, and 18. (he thinks) there are sufficient grounds to suppose the contrary.

cordance with our Lord's words on a similar occasion, seems in contrast with the words just uttered of Alexander. But it is rightly supposed by Benson that, as the Apostle had the gift of *discerning spirits*, he could know that in one case the conduct proceeded from unmingled malice, in the other purely from human frailty: which will account for the different ways in which they are spoken of; though this will not warrant any man, destitute of the same gift and authority, to denounce or foretell the like evil to any man whatever."

By πάντας the Commentators understand *very many*, so that *very few* remained with him. But this is unauthorized and precarious.

17. ὁ δὲ Κύριος μοι παρέστη. The παρέστη must be understood *figuratively*, i. e. was by me and with me, by secretly helping and supporting me. So (Heinr. observes) Homer says of Minerva in respect to Achilles παρέστη. Compare Ps. 109, 31. Acts 27, 23. The words καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέ show *how* that help was especially communicated, namely by infusing courage, and imparting (ἐν) ability. So Theophyl.: ἐχαρίσατο παρρησίαν. Thus Col. 1, 11. ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμουμένοι, and elsewhere; and also Aristid. cited by Wets.: ἀγώνισαι πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ, δυνάμεος δὲ μελήσει τῷ θεῷ. By κήρυγμα is here meant *the word preached, the Gospel*; as 1 Cor. 15, 14. Πληροφορηθῇ, "might obtain full credence." See Rom. 4, 21. Luke 1, 11. Πάντα is to be taken, Heinr. and Rosenm. say, *populariter*, for "many of different nations," i. e. who had business at the court. But they and other Commentators (as Doddr.) are wrong in supposing that the words are to be referred to his *defence* only. They refer to the preaching of the Gospel by him during his long confinement, by which in a manner all the nations might be said to hear it; since Rome was the resort of persons from every nation of the civilized world, individuals from each of which would hear the Gospel, and carry tidings of it, or diffuse its doctrines, in their respec-

tive countries. So Theoph. : ἵνα κατὰ δῆλος πᾶσι γένηται καὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος ἡ δόξα, καὶ τῆς περὶ ἐμὲ προνοίας ἡ κηδεμονία.

17. καὶ ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος. Some would take this literally, as referring to 1 Cor. 15, 52. But the context shows that it is to be understood of the emperor Nero. And so the antients and most moderns. And yet it is not clear to me that there is (as they say) an allusion to Nero's *cruelty*. The *lion*, being the king of beasts, was a fit, and indeed common image to designate *any* monarch invested with despotic power; examples of which signification, both Scriptural and Classical, are produced by the Commentators; as Esth. 14, 13. &c. The phrase ῥύεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ λέοντος, to denote being delivered from a very great danger, is easy to be accounted for: but there is probably an allusion to a well known fable of Æsop: for Paul's deliverance at court, which might be called the *lion's den*, would justify the expression in almost its literal sense.

18. καὶ ῥύσεται με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, "And the Lord *will* (I trust) deliver me from every evil work," i. e. all dangers, temptations, and calamities; for such appears to be the simplest interpretation of ἔργου πονηροῦ, on which the recent Commentators seek needless refinements. The propriety of language will not permit it to be interpreted, with them, "from every work of the Devil." Compare 1 Kings 17, 57. 2 Cor. 1, 11. I would observe, that though Wets. adduces a passage of Dionys. Hal., where this very phrase occurs, yet it is in a very different sense. The use in question may be regarded as a Hebraism. As to the term πονηρός, it often signifies *dangerous*, or unfavourable in any respect. See Schleus. Lex.

18. καὶ σώσει—ἐπουράνιον, "and he will (I humbly hope and devoutly pray) bring me safe unto his heavenly kingdom." The ellipsis in σώζειν εἰς τόπον τινα, by which some verb of *carrying* is omitted, is

found in the best writers, from whom many examples are adduced by Wets.

This pious profession of trust in the Lord was (as well as the whole of the preceding detail of personal traits) meant as a hint to Timothy and others to follow his example ; suitable to which is the fine *doxology* that follows.

19. Ἀσπασαι Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν, “ salute Prisca and Aquila ;” whom Paul had left at Ephesus. (Acts 18, 19.) See however Doddr. Theophyl. says Prisca is put first, as being more zealous in the cause of the Gospel.

19. καὶ τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον. It is little surprising that the Popish Commentators should chuse to infer from this salutation to the family of Onesiphorus, that he *himself* was dead (for on that slender foundation they chiefly found the *gainful* doctrine of prayers and masses for the dead), but that many eminent Protestant Commentators, as Grot. and Rosenm., should do the same, is amazing. For, as Benson observes, he might be gone from Rome, and yet not be at Ephesus, when the Apostle wrote this Epistle : or Onesiphorus might possibly be the bearer of this letter. But the best *argument* with the Romanists, is to urge that all the *antients* are agreed that he was *not dead*. They, however, say that he was yet at Rome : which, I confess, from supra 1, 16. (where see the note), appears not so probable. Heinr. maintains that in both places it may signify, by a familiar idiom, *Onesiphorus and his family*. And he compares οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Σωκράτη. But this appears precarious. It is sufficient to say that there is *no proof* that he was *dead*, and little *probability* ; since οἶκον would not have been so used. On the other hand, nothing is more probable than that he might be, to Paul’s certain knowledge, at some *other place*, and not Ephesus. Though, as to what Benson urges, that the strongest argument for proving Onesiphorus alive, is that St. Paul *prays* for him, since he *no where* prays for the dead, or any of

the Apostles ; that, in discussing the doctrine with a Romanist, can be no argument at all. It is taking for granted what is to be proved.

20—22. Ἑραστος. See Rom. 16, 23., Acts 19, 23. Τρόφιμον. See Acts 20, 4, 20, 4., 21, 29. The following Greek names are of frequent occurrence. Of the *persons* we know nothing. Linus, the antients tell us, was afterwards the first Bishop of Rome. By οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες we may suppose that the persecution had not entirely dispersed the Christians, but that some vestiges of a congregation (for such the οἱ ἀδελφοὶ imports) still remained.

On the salutation compare Gal. 6, 18., and the note.

EPISTLE TO TITUS.

This Epistle bears a strong resemblance to 1 Tim. (on which see Paley ap. Valpy.) Benson thinks the great design of it was to animate Titus, a Gentile convert and Evangelist, and Bishop of Crete, to oppose the Judaizing Christians. This is, however, too hypothetical a representation; and the design of the Apostle would seem to be far more general.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. *κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ.* The best Commentators are agreed that *κατὰ* here, as at 1 Tim., 1, 1., denotes *end* and *tendency*: and *ἐκλ.* Θεοῦ signifies, all faithful and sincere Christians. The sense, then, is: “in order to the propagation of the faith of sincere Christians, and in order to the acknowledgment or better knowledge of the truth which is conformable to true virtue.” (See 1 Tim., 2, 4.) Or it may simply be interpreted, with Theophyl., *religious truth*. Now *the truth* is tacitly opposed to the *errors* of Judaism, or *lies* of Heathenism.

2. *ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι—αἰωνίων.* Heinr. and Rosenm. take the *ἐπὶ* to have the sense of the *κατὰ* just before, i. e. “to the end.” So *εἰς ἐλπίδα*. See Gal. 5, 13., 1 Thess., 4, 7., 2 Tim., 2, 14. Most Commentators take *ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι* for *ἐν ἐλπίδι*; as Acts 2, 26., for 1 Cor., 9, 10.; and they connect the words with *δοῦ-*

λος—Χριστοῦ. But the former sense is the more natural and extensive, and worthy of the Apostle. The ζωῆς αἰωνίου, Theophyl. thinks, is levelled against the Jews, who only looked to temporal rewards.

2. ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεός, מַלְאָכִים לֵאלֹהִים. “A title (says Heinr.), ascribed by the Heathens to their Gods.”* The ἐπηγγείλατο appears, from the antithetical ἐφάνέρωσε, to carry a notion of *obscurely* promising. So Rosenm.: “In V. T. quidem vitâ æternâ non est promissa expressis verbis; promissa sunt vero multa et maxima bona per Messiam expectanda, quorum maximum est certissima spes æternæ felicitatis.”

Πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων. See on 2 Tim., 1, 9.

3. ἐφάνέρωσε, “hath plainly revealed it.” So 2 Tim., 1, 10., φανερωθείσαν δὲ νῦν. With καίροις ἰδίοις compare 1 Tim., 2, 6. (and the note), and Acts 1, 7. Ἐν κηρύγματι, “by the preaching of the Gospel.” So 2 Tim., 4, 17., and elsewhere. Κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ. Our Translators render, “by the commandment of God.” (On which see the note of Mackn.) This, however, is not very satisfactory; and, therefore, though this phrase has the above sense at Rom. 16, 26., yet I prefer, with the best modern Commentators, rendering it here, as also at 1 Tim., 1, 1., et alibi, “according to the will of God,” or more literally, *ordinance* of God.

4. γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κ. κ. π. Compare 1 Tim., 1, 2. Κοινῇ, “common to Jews and Gentiles.” So Benson and Heinr., the former of whom compares Jud. 3., 2 Pet., 1, 1. But it should rather seem to signify, “common to us both.” So Hilary, Beza, and Rosenm. Menoch. explains, “common to all Christians.” But that is too vague. The two last interpretations may be united.

Χάρις—ἡμῶν. See note on 1 Tim., 1, 2.

* Of Wetstein’s examples the only apposite ones are the following, Eurip. Or. 364., ἀψευδὴς θεὸς Ælian V. H. 14, 28., τῷ Νηρεΐ—ὑνὲρ ἀληθῆ τε καὶ ἀψευδῇ ἀκουομεν, Aristot. Polit. 2., οὐκ ἔστι πάντῃ ἄρα ἀψευδὲς τὸ δαμόνιον τε καὶ θεῖον; παντάπασιν μὲν, ἔφη. I add Pind. Olymp. 6, 114. (of Saturn), ψευδέων ἄγνωστον.

5. τούτου χάριν κατέλιπόν σε ἐ. K. By the κατέλιπον and the ἐπιδιορθῶσαι it is implied, that Paul had been there himself, and laid the foundation for the Ecclesiastical settlement of the Island. The Apostle here reminds Titus of the purpose for which he had left him (which, Grot. says, had been at the time he left Timothy at Ephesus), namely, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, i. e. literally, “that thou mightest further set right, or in order, the things which remained to be rectified, or which were imperfect and wanted completing, in my plans.” So Theophyl.: ἵνα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ τὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐλλειφθέντα. Such seems the best founded interpretation, and it is supported by the antients and the best moderns. Wets. aptly cites Plut. 2, 535, 14., χρηστὰς ὑπογράφεις ἡμῖν ἐλπίδας καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν λειπόντων ἐπιδιορθώσεως and Plut. 10, 844. E., ἵνα ἐπανορθώσῃται τὰ ἐλλείποντα which sufficiently justifies the slight incongruity in the mixture of the metaphors. The ἐπιδιορθ. *ordinare*, Grot. and Rosenm., from an ill founded scruple, would render *ordinare*; though indeed *ordinare* would, in this context, imply setting *right*, &c. It is well remarked by Theodoret: ἔδειξεν ὡς αὐτὸς ἔθηκε τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας θεμέλιον, κατέλιπον γὰρ σε, Φησὶν, ἵνα τὰ ἐλλείποντα διορθώσῃ.* The ἐπὶ denotes *succession* and *continuation*.

5. καὶ καταστήσῃς. The καὶ may mean *and especially*. The verb καθ. is, as Heinrichs observes, used of the chusing and appointing any one to an office; and nothing can be more clear than that the whole business was vested in Titus.† Κατὰ πόλιν,

* Hence the observation of Theophyl. on the humility of the Apostle in taking all the labour, and leaving Timothy all the credit and honour, by appointing Presbyters, is ill founded. For as the *foundations* of the Ecclesiastical establishment were probably laid by Paul, it would have been premature to appoint Presbyters.

† By this passage our Presbyterian brethren are, not without reason, put to great straits. The shifts to which they are driven may be conceived, when the sensible and pious Doddr. resorts to the disingenuous device of explaining it of the *interposition* of Titus (i. e. with the congregations), which, he adds, would have *great weight* with them.

“*in every city* where there is a congregation of Christians.” It is, with reason, supposed that many of these were but *towns* ;* and the use of πόλις by the best Classical writers justifies this. Ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διέταξα-άμην, “as I (on leaving you) directed you (in due time) to do.” Paul, it seems, had given the direction, but had not time to add the injunctions as to the qualifications ; and these therefore he now furnishes him with : and we may presume that no long time had elapsed since Paul had left the Island, when he wrote this Epistle.

6. Compare 1 Tim. 3, 2., and the notes. Τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, “having his children well regulated, trained in a sober and religious education.” Compare 1 Tim., 3, 4 & 5, 10., Μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας, for μὴ κατηγορεῖσθαι ἀσωτίας, “not to be justly accused of a disorderly life.” Ἡ ἀνυπότακτα, “disobedient and disorderly.” (See 1 Tim., 3, 4.) For he who cannot keep his own family in order, how can he be fit to be entrusted with the management of the great family of a Church.

7, 8. δεῖ γὰρ—οἰκονόμον. The Apostle repeats that the Presbyter shall be ἀνέγκλητος. So 1 Tim., 3, 2., δεῖ ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι. He here adds ὡς Θεοῦ οἰκονόμον ; for, as Rosenm. observes, if fidelity is required in the administration of perishable *earthly things*, (1 Cor., 4, 2.), how much more is it required in the steward of *spiritual affairs* ! Οἰκονόμον, i. e. the manager of God’s house or family, such as is every church. So in our fine Collect for Good Friday, “Behold thou thy family, for which our Lord Jesus Christ,” &c. Though sometimes a whole body is considered as one general family ; as 1 Tim., 3, 15.†

* These words πόλις, *urbs*, and *town*, which have given so much trouble to the Etymologists, appear to have one common idea, that of *hedging, inclosing, walling, &c.*, in opposition to *open villages*. For πόλις is cognate with πόλος, *a circle* ; and *urbs* is cognate with *orbis* ; and *town* comes from the Angl. Sax. Týnan, to *enclose* *encompass*.

† Heinr. compares Soph. Antig. 671., ἐν τοῖς γὰρ οἰκείοις ὅστις ἐστ’ ἀνὴρ Χρῆστος, φανέται καὶ πόλει δίκαιος ὢν. I would add

The αὐθάδη here answers to the φιλαυτὸς at 1 Tim., 3, 2. It is explained αὐταρεστος, *self-willed, proud*, &c. See a spirited sketch of the αὐθάδης in Theophr. Char. Eth. C. 15., Edit. Ast., and consult Stanley and Blomf. on Æschyl. P. V. 64. The ὀργίλον has no place in the former list; but it is nearly allied to the αὐθάδη. It signifies *passionate*. As to the other terms in this and the next verse, they have been explained at 1 Tim., 3, 2 & 3. On αἰσχροκερδῆ, Wets. cites Polyb. 6, 44., καθόλου ὁ περὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν τρόπος οὕτως ἐπιχωριάζει παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὥστε παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς κρησὶ τῶν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος.* The ἐγκρατῆ denotes, him who holds in restraint all his passions of every kind (See Theophyll.); which, as Pricæus observes, implies abstinence even from what is lawful. In which view he cites from Cicero: "Nullâ re conciliare facilius benevolentiam multitudinis possunt ii qui, &c., præsumt, quàm abstinentiâ et continentiâ.

The φιλάγαθον signifies a lover of good men, or of goodness, or both. The term is somewhat rare: but it occurs in Sir. 7, 22., and Dionys. Aræiop., cited by Suic. Thes. in D.; and also Aristot. Rhet. c. 2, 4., Cod. *Vet.* (which is the true reading; for the common one, τοὺς φιλεῖν ἀγάθους, is plainly from *emendation*.) On the δίκαιον and ὅσιον I add Diod. Sic. 2, 610., Dionys. Hal. 2, 697., and Schol. on Eurip. Hec. 788.

9. ἀντεχόμενον—λόγου, "adhering to the faithful doctrine according as he has been taught." Ἀντέχεσθαι signifies, properly, to hold fast by any thing, in

Cowper's Task, L. 5., p. 131., "For when was public virtue to be found where private virtue was not?" &c.

* But if by this Wets. would hint that the Apostle has any reference to the base avarice of the Cretans, he is mistaken. For the same remark would hold good of every one of the virtues here enjoined; the Cretans being stained with all the opposite vices; of which those who have read the antients, can require no proof. It is strange that Theodoret should affirm (at least by implication) that this is the only Island to which the Apostle carried the Gospel. He forgets *Melita*.

opposition (ἀντι) to one who would wrest it away : a signification often used in the metaphorical sense of the Classical writers. (See the examples of Rosenm.) Pricæus, with the approbation of Rosenm., would add μου from 2 Tim. But this is very uncritical. It may very well be understood ; though it also implies the doctrine Paul had been taught by Christ. Thus the διδαχὴ πιστοῦ λόγου is a periphrasis for *the Gospel*, the Christian religion.

At παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ Pric. and Rosenm. would supply μένειν. But this is too arbitrary. Παρακαλεῖν here simply signifies to *instruct* and, as we say, *instruct in*. Besides, this answers to the διδακτικὸν at 1 Tim. At the same time, this στηρίζειν is *implied* in the communication of sound doctrine, and the silencing of objectors. The force of ὑγ. διδ. has been explained at 1 Tim., 1, 10., and elsewhere. It is here truly remarked by Theophyl. : “Ὅγε μήτε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς μάχεσθαι, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζειν πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μήτε τοὺς οἰκείους παρακαλεῖν καὶ νοουθετεῖν καὶ στηρίζειν δυνάμενος, ψευδεπίσκοπός ἐστι.

10. εἰσὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, &c. The καὶ is in many MSS., with the approbation of eminent Critics, *omitted* ; but on very insufficient grounds ; for we can account for its omission, but not for its insertion. The particle is often omitted, when it *seems* useless, but *is* not. So here it may either be rendered, with Rosenm., *and those* ; or rather, “for many, *too*, there are,” i. e. many there are *as well* possessing the foregoing virtues, as the subsequent vices.

On the terms which follow, it is not necessary to refine, or to force them into an exact counterpart to the preceding virtues : a formal regularity very foreign to the Apostle's style. Ἀνυπότακτοι signifies *disorderly, unruly, insubordinate*, i. e. in respect to the sound doctrine mentioned above, and the teachers of it. This would be likely to be the case, especially with the Judaizers, from their characteristic *stiff-neckedness*, and little relish for spiritual doc-

trines, in comparison with external and carnal ordinances. *Ματαιολόγοι vain talkers, triflers, &c.*, those mentioned at 1 Tim., 1, 6., ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν. On the φρεναπάται we may compare Eph. 5, 6., κενοῖς λόγοις ἀπατῶντες. Rom. 16, 18., τὰς τῶν ἀκάκων καρδίας ἐξαπατῶντες. 2 Tim., 3, 13., πλανῶντες καὶ πλανόμενοι. So Theophyl.: καὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄλλους ἀπατῶν. By the οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς are meant *Jewish Christians*. That Crete, standing in the midway between Palestine and the civilized world, and so opportune for both, should swarm with Jews, were of itself probable, and it is confirmed by Josephus and Philo. See Wets.

11. οὗς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, *bridle in, restrain, silence*, namely, by the exercise of powerful reasoning, and Episcopal discipline. Ἐπιστομίζειν signifies, properly, to put a bridle, ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι; as 2 Kings, 19, 28., Is. 37, 29. Hence it often signifies, metaphorically, to check any one, reduce to silence, φιμῶν (2 Pet., 2, 15.) Wets. adduces many examples, to which I add Joseph. 778., τὴν νεωτεροποιᾶν ἐπιστ. Philostr. V. A. 3, 28., τὸν τύφον ἐπιστ. and Liban. Or. Parent. on Julian ap. Fabr. B. Gr. 7, 13., ἐνέφραξε τῇ καρτερίᾳ τοῖς πονηροτάτοις τὰ στόματα.

11. οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσι, “inasmuch as they subvert (the faith of) whole families.” So 2 Tim., 2, 18., τὴν πίστιν ἀνατρέπουσιν.* Of this sort were those described at 2 Tim., 3, 6., οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τοὺς οἰκίας, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες τὰ γυναικάρια. where the αἰχμ. includes laying them under contribution, and answers to the διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ, αἰσχροῦ κέρδους of the present passage. Compare Matt. 23, 14. The Commentators notice the litotes in ἃ μὴ δεῖ; as Is. 66, 4., ἃ μὴ ἐβουλόμην. So also Joh. 21, 18., καὶ οἷσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις.

* And so Joseph. Bell. 1, 17. (cited by Heinr.), οἴκους λαμπροτάτους ὅλους ἀνατρέπεσθαι. and the *totos domus et familias evertere* of the Latins; as Juvenal and Cicero. To which I add Plato 960 F., ὅλας οἰκίας χρημάτων χάριν ἐπιχειροῦσι κατ’ ἄκρας ἐξαίρειν. and Athen. 274 E., ὁ γὰρ κύλαξ—καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀνατρέπει.

12. εἰπέ τις—ἀργαί, “one of their own poets,” &c.

For προφήτης, like *vates*, was a term often applied, out of compliment, to denote a poet, to hint at the inspiration that was presumed to reside in him. This was indeed chiefly confined to the earlier and greater ones, as Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Musæus, &c.; but afterwards assumed by, or conceded to, poets in general. It was, however, very applicable to Epimenides, from whom this quotation is, I think, ascertained to be taken, since he was one of the earlier bards; and he is said to have written περὶ χρησμῶν. (See Fabr. Bibl. Gr.) Theophyl., too, here says, that he was one of the wisest of the Greeks, and θειασμοῖς καὶ ἀποτροπιασμοῖς προσέχων, καὶ μαντικὴν δοκῶν κατορθοῦν (a pretty flower of speech picked up, by the way, from Thucyd. 7, 50. speaking of Nicias).

With respect to the qualities here ascribed to the Cretans, the ψεῦσαι, *eternal liars*, is completely justified: for such *were* they to a proverb. So Diogen. in Pan.: Κρητίξειν, ἐπὶ τὸ ψεύδεσθαι. And as such it is often found in the Classical writers. See Wetstein's examples, which fully prove the ill repute in which the Cretans were held.* To these I add Suidas: τρία κάππα κάκιστα, Καππαδοκία, καὶ Κρήτη, καὶ Κιλικία. Leon Tarent. ap. Brunch Anal. 1, 242. Ἄλκι δήμιστα καὶ ἀλιφθόροι, οὐδὲ δίκαιοι Κρήτες* τις Κρητῶν οἶδε δικαιοσύνην;

With respect to the κακὰ θηρία, it seems to mean *malignant ferocious brutes*; a sense in which θηρία is not unfrequently used, like the correspondent terms in all languages; as the Hebrew בער (whence the Germ. Bauen, and the English *boor*), our *brute*, &c.

The γαστέρες ἀργαί, is by Dr. Hunt and Benson explained *swit-*

* The origin of the bad character of the Cretans is by Bp. Warburton, Div. Leg. 1, 159. ascribed to their having, by claiming the honour of showing Jupiter's tomb, proclaimed what was carefully concealed from the vulgar, that all the Gods were only mortals raised to divine honours for benefits conferred on their country or mankind. For this the learned prelate was indebted to *Chrysostom* and Theophyl., who probably borrowed it from some of the Classical writers; since Callim. Hymn on Jove 8. (cited by Wets.) says: Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύσται, καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ᾧ ἄνα, σεῖο Κρήτες ἐτεκτήναντο. And some recent critics (as Rosenm.) consider the line quoted by the Apostle as Callimachus's. But (as Whitby observes) he was no Cretan, but a Cyrenean; and he has only the first words of the verse, which, Jerome says, he borrowed from Epimenides. What followed in Epimenides we know not, and have no concern to know. But I should suspect that it was *not* what Chrys. has given; for if so, Callimachus's plagiarism would have been shameless. It is far more probable that he confounded the words of Epimenides and of Callimachus. At all events, the difficulty he raises is *none at all*; for the words following ἡ μαρτυρία—ἀληθής can only refer to what St. Paul has cited, not what *might follow*.

bellies, greedy devourers; ἀργός sometimes signifying *swift*. But the antient and common interpretation, *slow-bellies*, seems the more natural. According to this, *two* vices seem ascribed to them at once, namely, *gluttony* and *sloth*; for γαστ. may of itself denote gluttons (see Steph. Thes.), γ. d. all belly. And so the Latin *ventris*. The term ἀργός was often used of the *fruges consumere nati*." Indeed these two vices go together. See Wetstein's examples. Some take the ἀργός to signify *tardus*, Angl. *fat-bellied* and *slow*; as Juvenal 4, 107. Montani quoque venter adest abdomine tardus. See Ir-misch on Herodian, 1, 186.

13. δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, i. e. since they are thus. Ἐλεγγε α. ἀποτόμως, "rebuke them sharply." A metaphor (as Est., Heinr., and Benson think) taken from surgeons, who cut away the unsound flesh even to the quick, lest the mortification should extend. Compare 2 Cor. 13, 10. Rom. 11, 22. Thus the following ὑγιαίνωσιν has still greater propriety.

Ἐν τῇ πίστει, "in the doctrine and religion, the διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα, supra, ver. 9. So Theophyl. observes, that by this it is meant, that they are to retain it as it was delivered to them by the Apostle, without any admixture of Judaism or Gentilism.

14. προσέχοντες—ἀλήθειαν. He now shows in what respect he would especially have Titus watch over the soundness of their faith; namely, that they may not attach themselves to Jewish fables. See 1 Tim. 1, 4. and the notes.

By *Jewish fables* some think the Apostle means the Gnosticks' Cabbalistical interpretation of the Old Testament. But this is refuted by Whitby. The antients, and most moderns, rightly interpret it of traditions concerning *meats*, either καθαροί, ἅγιοι, ὅσιοι, or ἀκαθαροί, κοινοί, βεβηλοί, μεμιασμένοι, which our Lord himself, Matt. 15, 9., calls the *doctrines of men*: whence may be discerned the meaning of the ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων here; and I cannot but think that the Apostle had in view that passage of St. Matt. Theophyl. calls them the δευτερώσεις and παρεξηγήσεις of the Old Testament. Rosenm. understands the μῦθοι of fables properly so called; as of the battle of Gog and Magog, Behemoth, Leviathan,

and these various tales respecting the Messiah, as an earthly monarch; to which Jaspis adds spurious books, as the life of Abraham, the book of Noah, the testimony of the Patriarchs, and others. All these may be *included*.

In the clause ἀποστρεφόμενων, there is something cutting; q. d. “not only tales of mere men (and therefore of no authority), but of men averse from the truth.”

15. πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ τοῖς καθάροις.

Rosenm. paraphrases: “Si quis probus fuerit, omnibus cibis uti potest, nec ob ciborum in lege Mosis vetitorum usum Deo displicet; quia lex illa non amplius ad eum pertinet.” So Jaspis: “Sermo est non de *moral*i, sed de *rituali* pueritate, sensu Judaico; πάντα ergo, omnia, quæ pertinent ad ritus et ceremonias. Cogitur de promiscuo ciborum usu, de certorum dierum discrimine eorumque vel observatione vel neglectu et aliis ad externum cultum pertinentibus rebus.” Compare a similar sentiment in 1 Tim. 4, 4 & 5., and see the notes there. The paronomasia between moral and ceremonial purity is very neat. Καθαρός and ἀκαθαρός in a moral sense are frequent in the Classical writers.

In τοῖς δὲ μεμιασμένοις, &c. the Apostle dwells only on mental and moral purity: but he further enlarges upon it, in order to point a well merited invective against the false teachers in question. Heinr. explains thus: “To those Jewish impostors (who, in opposition to the καθαροὶ and πιστοὶ, i. e. true Christians, are called μεμιασμένοι and ἀπιστοὶ) *nothing is pure*, nothing benefits them to the production of purity, whatever they may say of meats pure and common; because their whole mind and conscience is contaminated.” And so Wells ap. D'Oyley., and also Benson. Ἀλλὰ μεμιάνται—συνείδησις. Theophyl. shows that they can never *attain* the purity they affect; since the pure animals in one or other way become impure: so that, he adds, ἡ ῥύπαρὰ διανοία κακῶς περὶ τούτων λογιζομένη, ἐαυτῇ συμμιαίνει ταῦτα, μὴ ὄντα φύσει τοιαῦτα. But this is (I think) not exactly the Apostle's meaning, who is speaking, I repeat, of moral rather than ceremonial purity. So Jaspis: “impīi quavis re semet ipsos inquinare, et sic Deo se exosos reddant. Itaque etiam vel anxie ratione habita vetitorum ciborum, minimè tamen Deo placere possunt, et hac ciborum abstinentiâ impietatem quasi compensare nequeunt.” So Mr. Valpy: “A Gentile convert, who lives up to the faith and precepts of Christianity, is clean and pure in the sight of God, while they who presume so much upon their distinctions, render themselves incapable by their obstinate infidelity and immoralities, to perform any acceptable service to God.” See also Doddridge's paraphrase.

See a very similar sentiment in Sirach 39, 32. Wets., too, adduces several others from the Classical writers; as Galen, ταῖς ἀκαρ-

θάρτοις ψυχᾷς, εἰ τροφίμους· προσφέρεις λόγους, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ὠφελήσεις ἂν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βλάψεις οὐ σμικρὰ. Seneca, Ep. 98. Malus animus omnia in malum vertit, etiam quæ specie optiuni venerunt, et de Benefic. 5, 12. Quemadmodum stomachus morbo vitiat, et colligens bilem, quoscunque acceperit cibos mutat—ita animus cæcus, quicquid illi commiseris, id onus suum et perniciem facit.

16. Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν—ἀδόκιμοι, “They profess to know, love, and serve the true God, and to be faithful Christians.” For such is the import of the formula Θεὸν εἰδέναι; as 2 Tim. 2, 19. (where see the note). And so it is interpreted by Benson and Heinr. Ἔργοις, *evil actions*, as opposed to fair pretences. Ἀγνούνται, as opposed to εἰδέναι, denotes, “do not care to know, but neglect and hate.” See the note on 1 Tim. 5, 8. The sense, then, may be briefly expressed, with Rosenm., thus: “destruunt re quod ore profitentur.”

16. βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες, “being really abominable, worthy of execration by God and man.” The καὶ before ἀπειθεῖς is rendered by Heinr. *quippe qui sint*. It may simply signify *nempe, even*. Ἀπειθεῖς, *disobedient*. The ἀδόκιμοι is by some rendered *reprobate*; by others (and indeed the best Commentators) *inepti, inutiles*; γῆ ἄδοκ., Hebr. 6, 8.: and Grot. thinks it a metaphor taken from bad money, which will not pass, and is therefore useless. Which of these interpretations be the true I know not. They both merge into each other; and it is truly observed by Grot.: “Tales autem sunt profani omnes, etiamsi quid faciunt *quod oportet*, non faciunt *ut oportet*.”

CHAP. II.

VER. 1. σὺ δὲ—διδασκαλίᾳ. From the διδασκ. which follows, it should seem that λαλεῖ signifies *teach*; a frequent sense of the word. It may, however, be used with a reference to private admonition and instruction as well as public teaching and preaching. On the ὅγ. διδ. see the note, supra, 1, 6.

2—6. πρεσβύταις νηφαλίους εἶναι, &c.

Œcumen. here subauds δεῖ. But it should seem that the λαλεῖ is to be repeated, with a slight accommodation of sense. Πρεσβ. is here taken by Hamm., Le Clerc, and Mackn. to denote, not *aged men*, but *Presbyters*; since the directions given are similar to those at 1 Tim. 1, 3. and πρεσβύτιδος at ver. 3. is applicable to those women who bore offices in the Church; as appears from the epithets ἱεροπρεπεῖς and καλοδιδασκάλους. But this is supported neither by the authority of the antients, nor the opinions of the moderns. And the qualifications do not sufficiently correspond. Neither is the word ever used in the New Testament in that sense. Something more may be said of the interpretation as it regards the *women*; and here there is somewhat of antient authority. Perhaps we may reconcile the two interpretations, by supposing that the Apostle, though he used these general terms, yet had also in mind those of both sexes who filled ecclesiastical offices, especially the latter. Certainly some of the epithets countenance this.

Νεφαλ. must here mean *sober*. The καταστήματι denotes not only *dress*, but in a general way, *deportment*.* Ἱεροπρεπεῖς. This is by most Commentators thought to regard the *dress*, which was to be decent, i. e. such as became Christian women, or Deaconesses. Heinr. takes it for εὐπρεπεῖς; (only the ἱερο. he thinks, may be intensive). But that epithet, as applied to dress and deportment, conveys an idea remote from the Apostle's thoughts. Δεδουλωμένας. This and the προσέχοντας at 1 Tim. 3, 8. are nearly synonymous; though the present is a stronger term, illustrated by Joh. 8, 34. and Rom. 6, 14. Καλοδιδασκάλους. It is obvious that this can only relate to *private*, not public instruction; as indeed is evident from the words following, which, as the antients observe, are to be closely connected with this, serving to show *what* they were to teach their children, servants, and friends.

Σωφρ. is here used as a vox prægnans; q. d. "that they may regulate their morals, and act as monitresses, teaching them, &c. There is by some thought to be an allusion to the σωφρονισταί, who at Athens were chosen out of the tribes, to superintend the morals of the ephēbi, or youths. But even that word was sometimes used in a figurative sense; as in Thucyd. 3, 15. σωφρονισταί ὄντος τῆς γνώμης.

In suggesting to the elder women what they were to teach the younger, the Apostle inculcates the *domestic* duties and virtues of wives; for *further* than this his injunctions do not reach. *Religious* duties they would be taught by the Deaconesses, Presbyters, &c. Of these domestic duties the first in order, as in importance, is that

* So; among the passages cited by Wets., Porphy. de Abstin. 4, 6. τὸ δὲ σεμνὸν καὶ τοῦ καταστήματος ἑώρατο. Simplic. on Epict. p. 278. ὥστε καὶ τὸ κατάστημα μὴ σεμνὸν μὲν οὕτω ὡς βαρὺ τοῖς παροῦσι φαίνεσθαι. He also (as do Rosenm. and Heinr.) cites Plut. 1, 824. βλέμματι καὶ κινήματι καταστηματικὸς. But there perhaps the sense is only *staid*.

of loving their husbands; for, as Theophyl. justly observes, *τούτου ὄντος, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔψεται, εὐθυνία οἴκου, καὶ χρημάτων περιουτία* ὥσπερ ἀπόντος, πάντα καὶ παρώσιν, ἀπορρήσονται. So Socrat. ap. Stob. Serm. 443, 32. *Εὐσεβεία γυναικεία ὁ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔως,* and Pericthyon ap. Stob. p. 488. *ἐθελήσει τὸν ἄνδρα.* The word *φίλανδρος* in its use, comprehended *dutiful respect*, &c. (See Wetstein's examples from Plato, Plutarch, and Polyænus)*, in which sense it is said, "her desire shall be to her husband."

On *σώφρ.* see 1 Tim. 3, 2 and 5. *Ἀγνὰς* Heinr. explains a *peccatis immunes*. But this is too vague. The term is of the same nature with the preceding; though a stronger one; and denotes, as Theophyl. observes, purity in *thought* as well as action. See 1 Tim. 5, 22.

Οἰκούρους. This term is a very expressive one, and denotes "those who stay at home and mind their own business." It answers to the *τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον* at 1 Tim., 3, 4. Thus it not only means *keepers at home*, but keepers or care-takers of the home, or house.†

Ἀγαθὰς. This is by some united with the preceding. A method, however, unsupported by any of the numerous passages above cited. Wolf rightly observes that it has a *special* signification. But that is not (I think) what he (in common with Casaubon, Vitringa, and many others), supposes, namely, *benignas, good tempered*, as opposed to *scolding wives*. No; the Apostle did not condescend to any one so special as that; but rather means what the Latins expressed by the *bona fœmina* (as Ennius ap. Wets.: "*Tarquiniî corpus bona*

* To which I add Apollon. Ep. 55. *γυνὴ σέμνη καὶ φίλανδρος.* and 58. *ἔχεις γυναῖκα ἔμφρονα φίλανδρον.* This is, however, not confined to the later writers. So in a beautiful passage of Æschyl. Pers. 140. *Περσίδες δ' ἀκροπενθεῖς ἕκαστα πύθῳ φίλανδρι, τὸν αἰχμαίνετα θοῦρον εὐνατῆρ ἀποπεμψάμενα, λείπεται μονζόυξ.*

† So Hesych. explains *φροντίζουσα τὰ τοῦ οἴκου καὶ φυλάττουσα* οὔρος γὰρ ὁ φυλαξ λέγεται. And it is explained by Theophyl. and Æcumen., *οἰκονομικάς*. Wets. here adduces numerous Classical examples, the most apposite of which is, Philo 2, 431, 24., *γυναῖκας κουριδίας, σοφρόνας, οἰκούρους, καὶ φίλανδρους.* To which I add Artemid. 1, 64., *οἰκουρὸς καὶ πιστὴ γυνή*, 232, 35 & 66., 1, 78., and 2, 33., *γυναῖκας κοσμίας καὶ οἰκοδεσποῖνας, housewives*, and 2, 33., *γυναῖκα πιστικὴν καὶ οὔκοῦρον, καὶ πειθομένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ.* Lycophr. 1095., *στεγανόμους* and infra, *οἰκουρίαν, domus curam, housewifery.* Soph. Trach. 542., Eurip. H. F. 45., *λείπει γὰρ με τοῖσδ' ἐν δώμασιν Τροφὸν τέκνων οἰκουρόν* and 1345., and Hippol. 787., *οἰκούρημα, housewifery.* So Eurip. Meleag frag. 12., and Æschyl. Agam. 1616. (of Clytæmn.), *σε τοῦδ' ἦκοντος ἐκ μάχης νέον, Οἰκουρὸς εὐνήν ἀνδρὸς*, &c. Except in the above passage of Lycophron, this *οἰκουρία* is no where more beautifully described than in Æschyl. Ag. 590—2. *Γυναῖκα πιστὴν δ' ἐν δάμοις εὖροι μολῶν, Οἶαν περ οὖν ἔλειπε, δωμάτων κύνα, Ἑσθλὴν ἐκείνῳ, πολεμίαν τοῖς δῶσφροσιν.*

foemina lavit et unxit"), and our ancestors, by *good-wife, huswife manager*. It is, therefore, exegetical of the preceding.

ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν. See Eph. 5, 22., and 1 Tim., 2, 13. "Ἴνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῇται. Compare 1 Tim., 6, 1. Theodoret remarks: Τὸ γὰρ προφάσει θεοσεβείας καταλιμπάνειν τοὺς ἄνδρας, βλασφημίαν ἔφερε τῷ κηρύγματι.

Τοὺς νεωτέρους ὡσαύτως παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν. The *νεωτ.* is for *néous*; as Joh. 21, 18. Σωφρονεῖν, "to cultivate sobriety and modesty." Virtues especially ornamental in youth, and estimable in proportion to their difficulty. To these virtues the Apostle desires Titus to exhort the young *men*; though he does not tell him to enjoin them on the young *women*; since it seemed scarcely necessary; such being, what may be called, *the* virtue of their sex, in which all others centre, and without which all are valueless.*

7. περὶ πάντα σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων. These precepts the Apostle directs him to follow up with his own example.

Πάντα, "these and all other virtues." Τύπον, *exemplar*. See Phil. 3, 17., 1 Thess. 1, 7., 1 Tim. 4, 12., and the notes. The *παρεχ.* is very significant. On this the Apostle then engrafts an admonition to *ministerial* virtues, in which he should be an example to the Presbyters. Ἀδιαφθορίαν depends upon *παρεχόμενος*, the sense of which must be *accommodated*, *per dilogiam*. It signifies uncorrupted purity, and soundness of doctrine. Ἀδιαφθαρτός is often used by the Classical writers; and numerous passages are cited by Wolf and Wets., in which it signifies one who is above all corruption in *any* self-interested motives. So Heinr. says it is opposed to the *καπηλεύω τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 2 Cor., 2, 17., and *πορισμὸν νομίζειν τὴν εὐσεβείαν*, 1 Tim., 6, 5.

Σεμνόνητα, *gravity, dignity*; ἵνα μηδὲν νεώτερον καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἄφρονας ἔχη ἢ διδασκαλία, ἀλλὰ πάντα σέφασμα καὶ ἄξια Θεοῦ, says Theophyl. The *ύγιη* is thought to be synonymous with the *ἀδιαφθ.* Only *that* rather regards the *person* than the *doctrine*. The metaphor

* This reminds me of a similar delicacy in that inimitable funeral oration of Pericles ap. Thucyd. 2, 45., εἰ δὲ με δεῖ καὶ γυναικείας τι ἀρετῆς, ὅσαι νῦν ἐν χρηεῖα ἔσονται, μνησθῆναι, βραχεῖα παραινέσει ἅπαν σημαινῶ· τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χεῖροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἢ δόξα, καὶ ἧς ἂν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον, ἀρετῆς περὶ ἣ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ᾖ.

has been before illustrated. Ἀκατάγνωστον. Theophyl. explains this ὀρθόδοξον, μηδὲν ἐπιλήψιμον ἔχοντα. But as the διδασκ. regarded the *doctrine*, so this, perhaps, respects the *manner and method*, and signifies *grave, dignified*, removed both from levity and affectation, and disdaining the μυθολογία, or any other methods pursued *ad captandum*. Then the words show the *effect* which this is calculated to have on the adversaries, whether Jews or Gentiles. So the ἀντικείμενος in a similar passage of 1 Tim. 5, 14.

At ἐξ ἐναντίας, must be understood μερίδος, or γνώμης. It is somewhat rare; but examples are adduced by Wets., from Thucyd., Xenophon, and Sext. Emp. Εὐτραπή. Some render this *blush, be ashamed*. Others, *feel respect*. Both may be united, the latter as the consequent of the former. Ἰνα ἐντρεπή also occurs at 2 Thess., 3, 14. Ἐχεῖν λέγειν—φαῦλον, in which ἔχειν is for δύναμαι, is a kind of phrase frequent, of which Wets. adduces many examples. By the ἔχειν λέγειν is meant, that when an adversary endeavours to recollect or gather any ill report of you, he cannot find any. Perhaps, too, there may be an allusion to what would happen when any of the οἱ ἐξ ἐναντίας came (as we know they did) to the Christian assemblies, to spy out some matter for calumny. So in 1 Cor. 14, 24. (which it is strange the Commentators should not have thought of) εἰάν δὲ εἰσέλθῃ ἀπιστὸς—κρίνεται. The two passages are the best comment on each other. It is here truly remarked by Theodoret: Ὅταν γὰρ καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ κοσμεῖται, καὶ τὰ γινόμενα συμφωνεῖ τοῖς λεγομένοις, ἐμφράττεται καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν φιλολοιδόρων τὰ στόματα.

9, 10. δούλους—μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας, sub. παρακαλεῖ. With this statement of the duties of servants compare other similar ones at 1 Tim., 6, 1. sq. Eph. 6, 5., and Col. 3, 22. Ἐν πᾶσι is to be taken *populariter*; as in Col. 3, 22. The ἐν πᾶσι is by some construed with the preceding; by others, with the following. The latter is the more regular construction.

The Apostle then touches on those faults to which slaves were especially prone; 1st., impertinence, in answering again to any reproof, either in denial or justification, grumbling; muttering, &c. Grot. compares the ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι of Rom. 9, 20., and says that such are called, by Plautus, *responsatores*.*

10. μὴ νοσφιζομένους. Doddr. here alters our Version much for the worse. No term better represents the sense of νοσφ. than *purloining*, which, though it designates theft of every kind, especially adverts to that too common form of it by which servants defraud their masters in buying or selling, or such other frauds as are denoted by the Latin *antevertere*. Πᾶσιν. On this see 1 Tim., 2, 2., &c. Ἐνδεικνυμένους, *exhibentes*. A Latinism. The reason suggested in ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν—ἐν πᾶσιν is similar to that supra, ver. 5. The ἵνα, however, may be taken in the *eventual* sense. By διδασκαλίαν, is meant *the religion*. Τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ. This I cannot but understand of *Christ*. See the note infra, ver. 13. Κοσμῶσιν, “may honour it, by showing its efficacy in promoting virtue, and, therefore, happiness.” Heinr. observes that this term is used of those who, by their life, morals, and actions, do honour to their teachers. So Eunap., cited by Wets.: λογγίνου μὲν ἦν μαθητῆς, καὶ ἐκόσμει τὸν διδάσκαλον ἐντὸς ὀλίγου χρόνου.

* And such the same writer describes in his *Menc.* (cited by Pric.): Argutos ut par pari respondeant (*give them a Rowland for their Oliver*); Ad mandata claudos, cæcos, mutos, debiles. With which may be compared a similar elegance of Cowper, Task 4., “The farmer’s hedge uptorn by strength Resistless in so bad a cause, but *lame* To better deeds—he bundles up the spoil, An ass’s burden.” Pricæus aptly adduces the dict of the Satyrist, *lingua mali pars pessima servi*. And he might still more aptly have cited Æschyl. Theb. 244., παλινστομεῖς αἶ (so I would point) Angl., “What then, you mutter again, do ye?” The preceding line is to be supposed pronounced, as our English Dramatists say, *aside*. Of this, however, the whole phalanx of learned Thebans (his Editors) seem not to have been aware. Had Bp. Blomfield perceived the *aside*, and remembered this passage of the Apostle, he would have suppressed his conjecture (acute and ingenious as it is) πολυστομεῖς.

Upon the ἀντιλογία, considered generally, I would use the words of Eurip. Prot. frag. 2., δυοῖν λεγόντων, θατέρου θυμουμένου ὃ μὴ ἀντιτείνων τοῖς λόγοις σοφώτερος.

11. ἐπεφάνη—ἀνθρώποις.

The connection may (I think) be thus traced: “(And this honouring of your religion you *all*, as Christians, are bound to aim at; since of all, of whatever rank, it is required) *for* the grace of God,” &c. Then he shows that in that religion is contained the obligation to avoid the vices, and cultivate the virtues above enjoined; and, in general, to live righteously, soberly, &c. After which he points out the very strongest *motives* to avoid the one and cultivate the other, arising from the expectation of a day of retribution; suggesting withal an *encouragement* to strive after virtue, in the atonement and expiation by Jesus; and, finally, the strong motive to perform all we are really able, from a regard to the *purpose* for which this atonement was made, namely, *to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*: since, without such a glorious hope of expiation, the despair might have been so great as to unnerve all virtuous exertion.

Such is (I conceive) the general scope of this noble portion of Scripture, than which none more plainly breathes inspiration.

The ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος is explained the Christian doctrine. But it may better be interpreted the Gospel, which revealeth the gracious method of salvation. The term was suggested by the διδ. τοῦ σωτήρος, &c. just before. Ἐπεφάνη, “have been revealed.” This expression is properly used of the appearance above the horizon of heavenly bodies. See Acts 27, 20. Luke 2, 79. and 2 Pet. 1, 9. But it was also used of the appearance of Deities upon the earth. That, however, is *here* very precarious. Πᾶσιν, “all of every nation, rank, age,” &c.

12. παιδεύουσα—ἐπιθυμίας. This construction of παιδ. with ἵνα is never found in the Classical writers. By παιδ., Rosenm. well observes, is meant not simply *teach*, but *bring men to any thing*, add arguments to instruction, and show the mode in which any thing ought to be done.* Ἀρνησάμενοι, *renouncing*. So Thucyd. 6, 56, 1. Ἀρμόδιον ἀπαρνηθέντα τὴν πείρασιν and Joseph. 671, 10. ἀνακρούσαμενον τὴν ἀμαρτίαν.

Ἀσέβειαν. This consisted not only in neglect of the proper object of worship, by idolatry; but also by those vices which invariably attended in its train; 1st, denying the existence of a God, or, what is practical Atheism, denying his properties and attributes, his providence and his governance of the world, and a state of future retribution. 2dly, acknowledging the existence and attributes of God, yet neglecting

* So Theodoret: ὑπέδειξε δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὴν εὐθεϊαν ὁδὸν, ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ βιοῦν κελεύσας.

to worship him (at least aright, as in idolatry), or setting him at nought by perjury, blasphemy, profane swearing, judging hardly, and speaking disrespectfully of his providence; finally, being disobedient to his will, whether manifested in the book of nature, or that of revelation. (See Benson and Mackn.)

12. τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, i. e. lusts, such as the world, the great bulk of mankind, gratifies. Pric. compares 1 Joh. 2, 16., which passage is, indeed, the best commentary on this phrase. Σωφρόνως. i. e. soberly, chastely, and prudently, with respect to ourselves; which imports, as Theophyl. observes, a government of all our passions, anger, and avarice, as well as sensuality. Δικαίως. i. e. justly, with regard to other men. Εὐσεβῶς, piously and religiously towards God. So Grot., who observes that these three contain a brief summary of Christian duty. Thus Philo speaks of the three canons, τὸ φιλοθέον, καὶ φιλάρετον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον. And Rosenm. cites Dionys. Hal.: εὐσεβεστέρους, δικαιοτέρους, σωφρονεστέρους, and Porphyry: σωφρῶν, ὅσιος, δίκαιος. It is obvious that in these *genera* are contained many other virtues *in specie*. See the excellent note of Whitby and Jortin ap D'Oyley.

12. ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι. For this, Theophyl. observes, ἔχει τὸν ἀγῶνα, ὁ δὲ μέλλων τὰς ἀντιδόσεις, this was destined for the probation of our faith; the other, for the retribution of our actions.

13. προσδεχόμενοι—Χριστοῦ. It is observed, by Grot., that προσδεχ. here signifies metonymicè, to look forward to that whither our hope tends, namely, the fruition of eternal life; as Job 2, 9. προσδεχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου. Thus ἐλπ. is the *thing hoped for*; as Gal. 5, 5. and Col. 1, 5., &c. Μακαρίαν, i. e. which makes us happy. So our *blessed* is often used. The καὶ is exegetical, and has the sense of *nempe, even*.

13. καὶ ἐπιφανείαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

There are few things more surprising in the history of sacred interpretation than the studiousness with which some distinguished scholars exert themselves to ascribe to these words such a meaning as no person (I think) of plain sense would ever have thought of. The most natural and obvious interpretation is surely that of the antients (except the Arians, &c.) and all the earlier moderns (except the heterodox, and also Erasm. and Grot., who appeal to Hilary and Ambros.), namely, "the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." This sense is satisfactorily vindicated by the labours of Beza, Whitby, Bull Def. Fid. Nic., and recently of Matthæi, and Bp. Middleton; though, strange to say, almost all critics take the other side. Surely, if the doctrine of the article, propounded by the learned Prelate above mentioned (and founded on the discoveries of former scholars), have *any* truth (as it undoubtedly has *some*) no other version can be admitted. But, waving that argument, this is a case in which, I conceive, great weight ought to be ascribed to the opinion of the Greek Fathers, certainly the best judges of the nice proprieties of their language. I cannot enter into the point so fully as its importance demands, but I would observe that the argument urged by Beza and Whitby, that *ἐπιφάνεια* is *no where* used, in the New Testament, of God, but of Christ, has never been answered, and is, I think, *unanswerable*. For it is in vain to urge that not God, but the *glory* of God is spoken of; since τῆς δόξης is there, by a common Hebraism, put for the adjective ἐνδόξον, and belongs to ἐπιφάνειαν. And so the E. V. This, too, is fully supported by the authority of the Greek Fathers and Commentators. Thus Theodoret: τῆς ἐνδόξου παρουσίας. And Theophyl. observes that this is called his *glorious* advent (as Matt. 25, 31.), in opposition to his *first* advent in humility (in the flesh). I would compare a very similar passage in the twin Epistle, 2 Tim. 4, 9. πᾶσι τοῖς ἡγαπήκοσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ, where see the note.

With these and other reasons for supposing it to be *Christ*, and not *God the Father* who is here meant, we may *safely* call to our aid the propriety of language as it regards the use of the *article*. And it is in vain that Grot. and others object that the Apostle is inattentive to the nice proprieties of the article. That may be; but we must not *suppose* an impropriety *unnecessarily*, especially when the context does not countenance it. Thus here, had the context been neutral, I should have been loath to urge the principle above mentioned, and would have admitted the sense to be *dubious*. But not so in the present case. Under these circumstances, I cannot but wonder at the inconsistency of Doddr. and Mackn., who, though acknowledging that the words *may* be rendered our great God and Saviour, yet, because they think the point *dubious*, choose to render it the *great God* and *our Saviour*. Which is *deciding* what they *call* *dubious* (and deciding in a way little to be expected from orthodox Divines); for by translating as in our Common Version, the point is decided; neither is there any *ambiguity* left. I cannot but suspect that all our Translators have been influenced more than they were aware, by an *argument*, specious, indeed, and employed by the maintainers of the new version, namely, that Jesus Christ is no

where styled *the great God*. To which I would answer, that the *μεγάλου* belonging to both Θεοῦ and σωτήρος alters the case, and removes that objection. The sense is plainly this: "the glorious appearance of *that GREAT BEING, who is our GOD AND SAVIOUR.*" I cannot omit to observe that the *ὅς* just after countenances this version; since had two persons been before spoken of, it would have been harsh to have suspended on that sentence a clause in which *one* only was meant.

14. *ὁς ἔδωκεν—ἔργων.* The sense of *λυτρώσεται* is strangely contracted by the recent Interpreters, who render it, *liberate, withdraw*. (See Rosenm.) Considering the idea of *salvation* implied in the *σωτήρος* just before, and that *ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* immediately precedes, it is plain that something more is intended than withdrawing men from sin, by pure doctrine and a holy example, sealed by death (which was partly true of *Socrates*), even the *atonement* and *expiation* offered up for all repented and forsaken sin, which, by paying the *λύτρον*, not only delivers us from the *punishment* of sin, but, from its power, supplies us with the strongest motives to abstain from all future iniquity. The *λυτρωσ.* is therefore a *vox prægnans*. (See Schleus. Lex.) The words following are exegetical of the *latter* part of this dialogia; and the best mode of considering the sentence is to regard it as consisting of two clauses blended into one, i. e. "that he might purify us to his service, and (thus) make us a people peculiarly his own, and beloved (as being), zealous of good works." Such is, I conceive, the true interpretation and sense, and it is supported by the most eminent Commentators.

Περιοσίον, in this Hellenistical use (which is supposed to be derived from the Sept.), signifies (as Chrys. says) what is *ἐξαιρετόν*, any thing especially *chosen out* from other things, and therefore *eximium* and *pretiosum*, &c. Such appears the most rational account of the signification, on which the modern Commentators bestow much labour, but with little success. There is, doubtless, an allusion to the election of the Jews, who were the *λαὸς περιουσίας*;

q. d. “now *Christians* are κατ’ ἐξοχὴν the λαὸς περιουσίας, even the Gentiles who receive the faith.” See Eph. 2, 10. & 3, 6—9. 1 Pet. 2, 9 & 10.

14. ζηλώτην καλῶν ἔργων, “zealously studious of good works.” A frequent sense of ζηλ. both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The expression is, perhaps, used in contradistinction to the Jews, who were ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου. Acts 21, 20.

15. ταῦτα λάλει—περιφρονεῖτω. Λάλει, *teach*; as ver. 1., where see the note. Ἐλεγχε Rosenm. renders *injure*. But this is an error arising from a want of attention to the brevity of the sentence, and a fault in punctuation of the *recent* editions, in which the comma after παρακάλει is improperly removed. The sense is; “The above doctrines and duties do thou teach, and exhort to the practice thereof; and (any who gainsay or neglect them) rebuke with all authority.” So Theophyl.: λαλεῖ πρῶτον καὶ παρακάλει, εἶτα ἔλεγχε. The μετ’ ἐπιταγῆς Theophyl. explains μετ’ ἀποτομίας, μετ’ αὐθεντίας, i. e. “in the exercise of the authority vested in thee and God’s ministers for that very purpose,” and of which Paul had given him the example as well as the precept.

15. μηδεὶς σου περιφρονεῖτω. He does not say, as to Timothy, despise thy *youth*; for Titus was a much older man; but, as appears from the ἐπιτ., “despise thee for the want of due authority and *firmness*,” i. e. give no one *cause* to despise. See the note on 1 Tim. 4, 12. Rosenm. observes that περιφρον. is a rare word, and hence some MSS. (by gloss) read καταφρον. He, however, adduces one from Eunap. (cited by Wets.): δι’ ἡλικίαν περιφρονηθεῖς. To which I add Thucyd. 1, 25. Lucian 3, 496 & 497. Aristoph. Nub. 226 & 741. It is well remarked by Theophyl., that authority and rebuke must be well timed, otherwise it will be despised.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. ὑπομίμνησκε—εἶναι. Compare 2 Tim. 2, 14. ὑπομιμ., *admonish*, &c. Rosenm. renders, *remind* them. That they needed this admonition appears from many passages of the Classical writers cited by Wets. The Jews, too, who were very numerous, were always ripe for sedition.

With respect to the words πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον—εἶναι, the Commentators, both antient and modern, are not agreed whether to refer them to the *preceding* or to the *following*. According to the former method, they will *define* the obedience, and limit it to *all things lawful*. And this is supported by most moderns. See Chrys. and Pric. According to the *latter*, they will suggest *how* obedience may arise, namely, from discharging the other duties. (See Calvin, Rosenm., and Kuin.) The *former* mode of interpretation, however, is most agreeable to the context and to the style of the Apostle.

As to the words following, μηδένα βλασφημεῖν—ἀνθρώπους, they need no explanation; and we have only to avoid the undue *limitation* of them by some Commentators (who confine the sense to *mildness towards those dissenting in opinion*, or peaceful subjection to government), and make the admonition co-extensive with the sphere of human duty; which was very suitable to those κακὰ θηρία.

3. ἡμεν γὰρ—ἀλλήλους. This suggests the *reason* for the lenity and mildness in question towards the brutal and bad; “For we *were* what they *are*.” (Compare Gal. 4, 3. Eph. 2, 3 & 11. 1 Cor. 6, 11.) A *popular* argument, many examples of which are adduced by Pricæus; as from Pliny, to a harsh father: “Cogita illum puerum esse, et te fuisse.” Though much more dignified is that of Seneca, cited by Grot.: “Faciet nos moderatiores respectus nostri, si consulerimus nos.” It is, however, more to the purpose to compare 1 Cor. 10, 12., as does Theo-

doret, who also aptly applies the saying of the penitent thief to his fellow, "for we are in the same condemnation."

Grot. and Whitby observe that the *ἡμεῖς* is used for *κοινωνοί*. Yet see Doddr.

On the words following it is not necessary to refine, or to suppose any regular digest of Gentile vices. The *ἀνόητοι* and *πλανώμενοι* both relate to errors in religion, by an ignorance of the true God, and the worship of idols. *Ἀπειθεῖς*, i. e. disobedient even to those duties which the law of nature teaches, and therefore inexcusable. See Rom. 1., which is also the best commentary on the present passage. *Δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις*. For the Cretans were, as Plato says, infamous for impurity of every kind. On the metaphor in *δουλ.* see the copious Classical illustrations of Wets. *Κακία* is explained, by Heinr. and others, of vice in general. But I prefer, with the antients and most moderns, to understand it of *malice*, *μνησικακία*, to use the expression of Theophyl. *Διάγω* literally signifies to *pass one's life*: as in a passage of Plut. cited by Wets.: *διαγ. ἐν οἴῳ*. The next words *στυγητοί, μισοῦντες ἀλλ.* have much force and beauty: but are strangely misunderstood by Mackn., who renders, "*hateful to the Gentiles*." But the Apostle is speaking of Jews and Gentiles. Whitby renders, "*hateful to one another*." It may rather be interpreted, with Heinr., "*hateful to God and good men*." So Philo, cited by Wets.: *στυγητὸν καὶ θεομίσητον πρᾶγμα*. He also compares Plato, *μισοῦντες, μισοῦνται*, which is imitated by Max. Tyr. Diss. 36. I add Soph. Aj. 1135. *μισοῦντ' ἐμίσει*. Aristid. 1, 356. *μισοῦντες καὶ μισουμένοι διῆγον*. Pausan, D. 6, 8. Appian 11, 29, 66. *οὔτε ἐστέρηγετο οὐτ' ἔστεργε*. With the *μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους* Pric. aptly compares Tacit. Ann. 14. *Invisi mutuis odiis*.

4. *ὅτε δὲ—Θεοῦ*. With the sentiment, which is very frequent, Heinr. compares Gal. 4, 3. seqq. Eph. 2, 3. 11, 12. and 1 Cor. 6, 11., &c. He ob-

serves that χρηστ. and φιλανθρωπία, though properly differing as genus and species, are yet synonymous with χάρις Θεοῦ at 2, 11. Thus they are conjoined in Philo 1002. (cited by Loesner) χρηστότητα γὰρ καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἐλπίσαντες ἐνιδρῶσθαι τῇ Γαίῳ ψυχῇ. Rosenm. here supplies ὅς πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι θέλει.

5. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων—ἀγίου. Now follows the *apodosis*: “we are admitted into the Christian religion.” This extends to ver. 8., and in it are enumerated the especial benefits of which he is made partaker who is admitted to the Christian religion, namely, baptism, redemption, the aid of the Holy Spirit.” (Hein.)

At τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ must be understood ὄντων. And ἐν. δικ. is a phrase for the cognate adjective δικαία. Κατὰ, *according to, out of, &c.*, i. e. *mercifully*, like the διὰ τῆς χαρίτος, Gal. 15., or the Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, Eph. 2, 9. So Grot., who, in common with the best Commentators, interprets ἔσωσεν “put into a state of salvation;” implying admission to the Christian religion and all its benefits, both of knowledge and happiness, both here and hereafter. See Acts 2, 47. and 1 Tim. 2, 4. and the note on Matt. 2, 21.

5. διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.

It is well known what controversies have been raised upon the sense of this expression, into which I shall not enter, since they are now, in a great measure, settled: all the most enlightened Interpreters have been long agreed that the opinion invariably supported by early Fathers is the true one, namely, that *baptismal regeneration* is here meant; baptism (to use the words of our 27th Article) being a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; and the promises of the forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.

I cannot enter at large into the subject; but I would observe, that upon a point where those, both of antient and modern times, who were the likeliest to come at the truth, have agreed upon any interpretation, there is the greatest reason to believe it true. Such, I think, is the case here: and I would refer to a remarkable passage of Chrys. 1, 328., which fully shows the opinion of that eminent Father. At the same time, I cannot think that the words καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος ἁγίου are to be explained (or rather explained away), as they are done by some. (See Benson, who applies this

solely to Paul.) The true force of the ἀνακαίν. πν. ἁγ. seems to be best explained by Dr. Gloucester Ridley ap. D'Oyley; and I will only add, that the disputes upon baptismal and moral regeneration have too often degenerated into logomachias; whereas, if the disputants would take care to define the terms they employ, and have the patience to understand each other, they would be found to differ far less than they seem to do. This rare word (for so it is) παλιγγ. has, I have observed, sometimes in the antient writers, the signification of *moral reformation*. So Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 3, 23. fin. διδοὺς μέγα παράδειγμα μετανοίας ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα γνῶρισμα παλιγγενεσίας. With respect to the baptism of John, on which so much has been said, I have noted a remarkable passage in Joseph. Ant. 18, 6, 2., from which it appears that that was not understood to convey regeneration: οὕτω καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τίνων ἁμαρτάνων παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων (scil. αὐτῶν), ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνεῖα τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προκεκαθαρμένης.

6. οὐ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως. According to the interpretation above adopted this verse requires little explanation. Ἐκχέω, and similar words in all languages, are used in the sense *abundantly impart and confer*. Διὰ I. X. i. e. not merely by his religion (as Rosenm. explains), but by his intercession and advocacy, as our great High Priest.

7. ἵνα δικαιωθέντες—αἰωνίου. Notwithstanding what Rosenm. says, δικαιωθ. must be understood of *remission of sins*, and not be taken in the vague and precarious sense he assigns, namely, “tales facti, quales esse debemus.” The ἵνα δικ. depends upon ἔσωσε; and the usual signification of the term (on which I have often treated on Rom. and Gal.) here yields a satisfactory sense. The phrase κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου is, as Heinr. says, for ἐλπίδος ζωῆς. Grot., Knatchb., and Rosenm. would construe ζωῆς αἰωνίου with κληρονόμοι, and take κατ' ἐλπίδα in the sense *prout speramus*. But this is too harsh.

Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. shows that the Jews often used the phrase “*inheritance of life in a future world*.”

8. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. A frequent formula introductory of some important truth. Διαβεβ. has the deponent sense *affirm*; as in 1 Tim. 1, 7. where see the note. Heinr. would subaud τοὺς ἀκούοντας σε. The

construction is : ἵνα οἱ πεπιστευκότες τῷ Θεῷ φροντίξωσι προϊστασθαι καλῶν ἔργων, where οἱ πέπιστ. is a periphrasis for οἱ πιστοὶ, *Christians*. By καλῶν ἔργων some, as Grot. and Le Clerc would understand, their honest calling and trades. And this were indeed a precept not unworthy of the Apostle, and of which he furnished the *example*; yet, as being engrafted on a passage in which the benefits of redemption are enlarged on, it seems not sufficiently elevated. Preferable is the interpretation of the antient Commentators and some moderns, *works of benevolence*. But even *that* seems too limited a sense. The common interpretation, by which it is extended to *good works of every kind*, is far more natural, and worthy of the Apostle; and is supported by what follows: for in the pursuit of curious *speculations*, and scholastic subtilties, unconnected with the main articles of our faith, and the common rules of human duty, practice is too often neglected.

8. προϊστασθαι with a genitive, signifies to *sedulously exercise*, of which sense many examples are adduced by the Philologists. So that the two terms taken together, φροντ. and προϊστ., convey a strong sense. Of the τὰ καλὰ and ὠφέλιμα also many examples are adduced. I suspect, indeed, that this was a not uncommon phrase.

9. μωρὰς—περίστασο. See note on 2 Tim. 2, 16 and 25., and see also 1 Tim. 1, 4. The Apostle here distinctly explains his meaning by μάχας νομικὰς, i. e. disputes on curious questions connected with the interpretation of the Mosaic Law. Ἀνωφελεῖς, *useless*, nay (per litoten) *pernicious*.

10. αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοθεσίαν παραιτοῦ. By the association of ideas, the mention of *frivolous questions*, and *curious subtilties*, led to that of the *heresies* and *schisms* which they tend to generate. On this word αἶρετ., as well as σχίσμα, there has been much, though perhaps needless, discussion. It may be sufficient to observe, that, though a vox media, yet in the ecclesiastical sense,

αἶρετ. signifies *one who takes up* any doctrine or doctrines in opposition to the fundamental truths of the Christian religion; and that a *schism* is a separation from the rest of Christians, on account of these αἵρέσεις. It would be easy to say much more on the subject; but this is not the place to treat on it. It must be borne in mind, that the Apostle here especially adverts to *Judaizers*.

10. μίαν καὶ δευτέραν, *first or second; cardinal* for ordinal, on which I have before treated. Παραίτου, “decline all familiar intercourse with.”

11. εἶδως ὅτι—αὐτοκατάκριτος.

The sense of these words is not a little obscure, and consequently variously explained. I can neither enter into those diversities, nor into the tedious and interminable controversy on this and the following verse. The words (I think) are meant to suggest a *reason* why all intercourse with such a person is to be avoided; and the difficulty hinges upon αὐτοκατάκριτος, which some eminent Commentators think may mean “one who furnishes matter of self-condemnation against himself.” But this seems very harsh, and little agreeable to what preceded. The antient interpretations, from their simplicity, deserve more attention. Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen. explain it ἀναπολόγητος, or condemned by himself, and his own conscience. Theodoret, most acutely and, I think, truly, remarks, that the import of the whole verse is ἀνοήτος γὰρ ἔστι ὁ πόνος. If, therefore, these interpretations be *conjoined*, we may (I think) approximate to the truth; q. d. “Such an one avoid; for he is utterly perverted, and therefore no good can be expected: he sins self-condemned, and is so *inexcusable* that you may justly break off intercourse; and by his being already *self-condemned*, you need not keep up intercourse with the intent of *convincing* him of his error; for of *that* his conscience must and does admonish him.” In all this I see nothing to stumble at, if the saying be taken *populariter*, and not too much pressed upon. See the able note of Whitby and Dr. Forster’s Letter to Stebbing. To enter further into the subject would be here out of place. Suffice it to say, that it has not been enough borne in mind, that the *heretics* of those times, by maintaining opinions at variance with those of the inspired Apostle, who even *worked miracles* in confirmation of his Divine mission, were indeed inexcusable, and must have been self-condemned. But that will not prove that *all* heretics of *every* age are to be pronounced self-condemned; and therefore no Minister ought to presume to take the high ground which *Titus* was authorized to do; but, under the altered circumstances of the case, to show indulgence to human infirmity, whenever the error cannot be traced to a *conceited or factious spirit*, which appears to be the *very essence* of the sin of heresy.

12—15. This portion is wholly occupied with *practical* matter, and is too familiar to need much explanation. Of Artemas we know nothing. Some think he was one of the Apostle's scribes. On Nicopolis see the Geographical writers, or Schleus. Lex. By τὸν νόμιμον is meant one who *had* been an interpreter of the *Jewish Law*, or one who *was* a *Jurisconsult*; for, as Rosenm. observes, even the Greeks were admitted to the Roman bar. Σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον. On the force of this word I have before treated. Benson thinks that St. Paul knew Zenas and Apollos were to pass through, or touch at Crete; and therefore gave this direction. (See more in his note.) On Apollos see the Acts 18, 24. and elsewhere. Μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι. The δὲ καὶ stands for *autem*.

The Apostle then takes occasion again to enforce the direction *supra* ver. 8, which is the best commentary on the present. See the note there. The καλῶν ἔργων must *here*, from the context, be limited to works of *benevolence, hospitality, &c.* The words εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας are explained by the ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις of the above mentioned verse. In the ἵνα μὴ ὥσιν ἔκαρποι there is a very common metaphor. See Matt. 13, 22. and Mark 4, 19. So it is elsewhere said, "Faith without works is dead (and fruitless)." See also 2 Pet. 1, 8.

15. τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει. Here ἐν has the sense of the Hebr. ב, "*by* and *through*, because of the common faith."

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

VERSE 1. δέσμιος Χριστοῦ 'Ι., a prisoner for the sake of, in the cause of Jesus Christ and his doctrine. See 2 Tim. 1, 8. Συνεργῶ, i. e. literally, "helper in the business of religion," whether as being a *Deacon* (which some conjecture), or because, as we find from ver. 2., a congregation assembled at his house, or on *both* these accounts. And though the term συνεγὼς was often applied (as Benson shows) to those who were not *ministers*, but only in a general way furthered the cause of the Gospel; yet he was probably a Deacon.

2. Ἀρπία. A Roman name. This person was (as the antients inform us) wife of Philemon; and Archippus was his *son*. Benson, however, thinks he was *not*; though perhaps he might live in his house, and officiate generally as a minister in the family, in their daily Christian worship. Rosenm. thinks it appears from Col. 4, 17. that he was a *minister*; but whether at Colosse or Laodicea (with whose teachers he is numbered in the Const. Apost. L. 7, 46.) is doubtful. He might be a minister of both, at different times, and probably Laodicea *last*. All these matters, however, are as uncertain as they are unimportant.

2. τῷ συστρατιῳ̃τι. This seems to answer to the συνεργῶ; and his being named *comrade* seems to show that he was a *fellow-minister*; though the term

would be applicable to a *private* Christian; since all are bound to fight the good fight of faith. Rosenm. observes, that in Herodian, the Emperor Marcus calls his son Commodus *συστρατιωτῆς*, *colleague*. But as they were both soldiers, it might mean *comrade*; and by that name generals often familiarly addressed those under their command.

2. καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκον (scil. οὔσῃ) σου ἐκκλησίᾳ, “the congregation which assembles at thy house,” i. e. Philemon's. It has been doubted whether this means all the Christians at Colosse, or *his own family*. It should seem, *neither*. Benson has given good reasons for supposing that we are not to understand it of the *whole* Church at Colosse assembled at Philemon's house, but only of a *part*; and I have on the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians shown that at this early period, before the members of this “new sect every where spoken against,” were allowed to build churches, they assembled in *conventicula*, or little parties, at the houses of some of the most zealous and influential persons, and those who had convenient room for that purpose. Though it is probable, considering the mode of building in the East, that they would often assemble in the *open court*, around which the buildings of a house are erected. Heinr. compares the case of Christians of the present day assembling at the houses of *foreign ambassadors*.

3. χάρις—Χριστοῦ. This has been before explained.

4—7. The Apostle here, with great earnestness, comes nearer to the point, and thanking God that Philemon had been kind already, and done as much in other instances as he was going to ask him, urges him by *his past example*, to act like himself: a most insinuating and skilful introduction to his request. (Benson.)

On εὐχαριστῶ—μου compare 2 Tim. 1, 3. and the note. The *trajectio* is obvious. Heinr. observes, that ἡ εἰς πρὸς τὸν Κ. Ι. is to be referred to τὴν πίσ-

τιν, the nearer antecedent; and (ἣν ἔχεις) εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, to ἀγάπην, the more remote, per Chiasmum et Synchronism. See Matt. 20, 21. and the Acts 20, 21. "These things (says Benson) make the perfect Christian."

6. ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία—Ἰησοῦν. Heinr. thinks that the ὅπως is *eventual*, "whence it follows." But I prefer, with Theophyl. and the earlier moderns, to subaud προσευχόμενος from the preceding προσευχών. The use of ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως is somewhat harsh. Heinr. takes it for κοινωνικὸς at 1 Tim. 6, 18., as involving a notion both of mildness, and *liberality*. And so Beza, Hamm., Whitby, Wells, and also some antients. But most antients and the most eminent moderns are agreed that it stands for ἡ πίστις κοινωνίας, and that for an adjective, i. e. (as Theophyl. explains) ἣν κοινὴν ἔχεις ἡμῖν, "which you have in common with us." At all events there seems no authority for, or propriety in our Version *communication*; though it is adopted and defended by Mackn. The above interpretation is supported by Jude 3. γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, and Tit. 1, 4. κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν Ἐνεργῆς γένηται, "should be effective." (So Theophyl.: ἐμπρακτος, καὶ οἶον ζῶσα), i. e. effective, especially in the way suggested at Gal. 5, 6. δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, where see the note. The ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. Rosenm. takes for σὺν ἐπιγν. But I prefer the more usual sense *by*. So Theophyl.: ἐν τῷ ἐπιγινώσκειν σε πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν. Heinr. explains: ἵνα ἐπιγινωσθῇ. Finally, εἰς Χριστὸν is put for ἐν Χριστῷ, or *for the honour, to the honour* of Christ. But upon the whole, from the laxity of the terms, it is difficult to exactly determine the sense of the verse. The whole is rendered by Wets. thus: "Ut fides, quæ tibi nobiscum communis est, juncta scientiæ omnis boni, quod alter alteri ex doctrinâ Christi præstare tenetur, quodque Christus tanquam sibi præstitum imputabit, efficax fieret."

7. χάριν γὰρ—διὰ σοῦ. It is not agreed among the Critics whether χάριν, or χαρὰν, be the true reading.

The former is found in many antient MSS., Versions, Fathers, and Commentators, and is supported by Erasm., Grot., Bengel, Griesb. The latter is defended by Wets., Matt., and Alter. Benson says, "it is all one; since the Greek Commentators and Scholiasts explain χάριν by χάσαν." But that is the strongest reason for supposing χαρὰν a mere gloss. The sense is the same. Παράκλησιν, *solace, consolation*. Theophyl. explains, παρηγορίαν. By τῇ ἀγάπῃ is meant that benevolent spirit which so frequently exerted itself in *works of beneficence*; which is the sense of ὅτι τὰ σπλάγχνα—σου; these words being exegetical of the preceding. The τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἁγίων are variously explained; by some, as Est., Casaub., and Menoch., of the *persons themselves*, with a notion of *misery calling for pity*. Theophyl. interprets: ὁλοφύχως ἀποδέχονται τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν σου, ὡς ἀφθόνως καὶ θεραπευτικῶς εἰς αὐτοὺς γινομένην. Far more natural is the interpretation of the most eminent moderns, namely, *minds, hearts*. And this is supported by Theophyl., who explains καρδίας. See Grot., Beza, and Scultet. As this sense of σπλάγχνα is somewhat rare, I shall subjoin two or three examples which have occurred to me. Dionys. Hal. 1, 518, 16. ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ἐντετήκεια, *animo insidens*. Lycophr. Cass. 465. δυσμενεστάτου ξένων"Ετυψε δ' ὥρῳ σπλάγχνον, *animum*, "*touched his heart*." Æschyl. Ag. 966. σπλάγχνα δ' οὐτι ματαίξει Πρὸς ἐνδίοις φρεσὶν τελεσφόροις Δίναϊς κυκλούμενον κέαρ.

8. He now comes to what he has to request of Philemon in favour of Onesimus. This extends to ver. 21. A part of the Epistle the most important and interesting, in which is strongly portrayed the mild and forgiving disposition of the Apostle. (Heinr.)

8. διὸ, "This being the case," i. e. since you have evinced so benevolent and liberal a spirit to Christians. So Theophyl. Παρρησία properly denotes, 1. liberty of speaking any thing one pleases; 2. liberty of *action*; as here. Schleus. adduces as examples

Dio, p. 41. and Zosim. p. 255. This may be reckoned among the euphemisms of the Apostle, and is *not*, as Heinr. says, *jocosè dictum*. Τὸ ἀνήκον, “what is fit, proper, becoming in you as a Christian.”

9. διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην μᾶλλον παρακαλῶ, “I rather (chuse to) exhort you, for love’s sake,” i. e. by arguments drawn from love (both towards me, and all Christians). For it seems best to take the ἀγάπην with this extent of signification. Τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος. The force of this periphrasis is thus expressed by Grot.: “Cum talis sim, qualem me esse nosti, nempe Paulus senex,” &c. More elegantly and properly by Wets. thus: “Cum talis sim, ut tibi imperare possim: magis tamen hortor; tanquam senex, inquam, imo etiam vinctus, hortor et obsecro te, certus preces meas apud te non fore irritas.” And he cites Andocid. in Alcibiad. ὃ δὲ πάντων δεινότατόν ἐστι, τοιοῦτος ὢν, ὡς εὔνους τῷ δήμῳ τοὺς λόγους ποιεῖται. Heinr. observes, that there are three arguments on which he grounds his request: 1. as being an *Apostle* to whom Philemon was indebted; 2. as being an *old man* (and to such we are loath to refuse a request); 3. as being a *prisoner in the cause of the Gospel*, i. e. for the Gospel’s sake. See Benson’s copious illustrations. He, in common with some others, takes πρεσβύτης in the sense *ambassador*. But the other interpretation, which is supported by the united authority of both antients and moderns, is greatly preferable.

10. παρακαλῶ—δεσμοῖς μου. Heinr. conjectures παρακ. δὲ. But this would be offensive so soon after another δὲ: and the propriety of the sentence will sufficiently appear by considering that the παρακαλῶ is *resumptive*; and σε is here expressed, because it was omitted before; being left to be supplied from σοι. Finally, the words τοιοῦτος—Χριστοῦ are parenthetical, and ought to be so expressed in punctuation.

The metaphor at ἐγέννησα is common both in the Scriptural and Rabbinical writings, by which dis-

ciples are said to be begotten again by their masters. See 1 Cor. 4, 15. and 2 Tim. 1, 2. Ὁν after τέκνον, is used by the προς τὸ σημαινόμενον.

11. τὸν ποτέ—εὐχρηστον. A most skilful and refined turn, not easy to be paralleled. See Benson, who has ably pointed out the exquisite contrivance and judgment shown in this introduction to the request to be made. Doddr., with his usual taste, observes on the fine effect produced by reserving the name Ὀνήσιμον to come last in the sentence. The etymology of the name doubtless (as Doddr. remarks) suggested to the Apostle the circumstances of the ἄχρηστον and εὐχρηστον.

The critics are agreed that ἄχρηστον must be taken, per litoten, in the sense *injurious*. For they infer from ver. 18., that Onesimus had not only deserted his master, but robbed him. Yet it is not necessary to so interpret the ἄχρ.; and the εἰ δὲ—ὀφείλει at ver. 18. will not *prove* that he was guilty of *theft* properly so called: for ὀφ. is never so used.

The σοι καὶ ἐμοὶ suggests, that as he had been useful to Paul, and trust-worthy, so now he would be so to Philemon. Ὁν ἀνέπεμψα, and (as such, being so) I have sent him back." For that is all that is meant by the ἀνὰ, which I am surprised Heinr. should take for εἰς τὸ ἄνω, *to Asia*. I remember indeed that the word has often that sense in Thucyd., Xenophon, &c.; but here it would be harsh.

12. σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν—προσλαβοῦ. By the τὰ σπλάγχνα, Commentators are agreed, must be meant *mine own son*, as it were *myself*. So Arrian, 1, 46. τὰ σπλάγχνα τὸν παῖδα σημαίνουσιν. Many more examples may be seen in Wets., to which I add Soph. Antig. 1053. ἐν οἷσι τῶν σῶν αὐτὸς ἐκ σπλάγχνων ἕνα Νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντιδοὺς ἔσει. Rosemn. compares Esth. 7, 3. Προσλάβου, i. e. "take him (again) to thy family, protection, and confidence; receive him back with kindness;" as Acts 28, 2.

13. ὃν ἐγὼ—εὐαγγελίου. Benson thinks this is a tacit answer to the objection, If Onesimus be so

dear and serviceable, why have you sent him back? Or rather the connection may be thus traced: “(He will *deserve* your protection by his faithful service, for such he is prepared now to render) insomuch that I could have wished to have kept him to myself.” The ἐβουλ. is for ἐβουλ. ἂν; as often. See the note on Matt. 26, 39.

13. ἵνα ὑπὲρ σοῦ διακονῇ μοι. Heinr. interprets this: “that he might be a servant to *me* instead of being one to you,” i. e. render *me* the service he owes *you*. But ὑπὲρ σοῦ cannot have that sense, which, moreover, were too formal a one. Nor, probably, did the Apostle require a servant to wait upon him. The ancients, and the most eminent moderns, rightly (I think) understand the διακ. of those *kind offices* which Onesimus himself was bound, by duty and affection, to render to his spiritual father; nay, which were due from *all* Christians, especially Gentile ones, in whose cause he was suffering persecution, for that is suggested by the ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς.

14. χωρὶς δὲ—ποιῆσαι, “But without thy knowledge and consent I would do no such thing, not even though the service would be in the Gospel’s cause.” I would compare Herodian. 5, 1, 15. ἐμοὶ δὲ σκοπὸς, μηδέν τι πράττειν ἄνευ τῆς ὑμετέρας γνώμης.

14. ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην—ἐκούσιον, “That the benefit (*if you chuse to give him up to me*, or, as Benson explains, *of pardoning and receiving him into favour*) may not be, as it were, compulsory, but voluntary. Τὸ ἀγαθόν, *the benefit*. An example of this sense (somewhat rare in the Classical writers) is adduced by Wets. from Arist. Others may be seen in Georg. Vindic. N. T. p. 23. The κατ’ ἀνάγκην is opposed to the κατὰ ἐκούσιον of the former clause. Schleus. adduces an example from Polyb. 2, 39. οὐχ ἐκούσιως, ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἀνάγκην. It frequently occurs in Thucyd. The antithetical κατὰ ἐκούσιον, which must be taken as an adverbial phrase, occurs (I think) no where in the *Classical* writers; though it is found in the Sept. at Num. 15, 3. to express the Hebr. בכרבה, and also

at Levit. 7, 16. 23, 18 (cited by Schleus.). The Apostle would more correctly have written ἐκούσιον, which is explained by Hesych. θελούση διανοία, or ἐκουσίως; as in the above passage of Polyb. But, with his usual fondness for antithesis, he employs κατὰ, to correspond to the κατὰ in κατ' ἀνάγκην. On the *sentiment* see Benson.

15. τάχα γὰρ—ἀπέχης. The γὰρ refers to some clause omitted (which Heinr. expresses thus: “Nil mali nobis accidit, unde non oriatur aliquod commodum.”) “Thus, for example, he was separated from you for a time, that he might remain with you for ever.” Commentators, antient and modern, remark on the euphemism in ἐχωρίσθη. Heinr. thinks that the διὸ τοῦτο and ἵνα may only mean (populariter) “hinc forte illud efficietur.” But this criticism were better adapted to a passage of some Classical writer than of a Christian Apostle addressing a faithful fellow Christian. The antients, and most moderns, have rightly remarked, that the words suggest the *probability* (for such τάχα implies) that this separation, or flight of Onesimus, happened κατὰ θέαν οἰκονομίαν, by Divine Providence; and this is ably illustrated by Benson. There was (he observed) no human intention on the part of Onesimus or Paul, or Philemon, to accomplish an event which had led to much good; therefore Providence might probably be supposed to have brought it about for the good of Onesimus, and eventually of Philemon. Compare Gen. 45, 5. & 50, 20. This could not justify Onesimus's running away (Rom. 3, 8.), but hence is magnified the gracious mercy of God, who had brought good out of evil.”

15. ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχης. This clause has been ill understood, by the not attending to that dense brevity of expression, by which it stands for two sentences, and should be expressed thus: “That thou mightest receive him back from me reformed, and thus to remain with thee for ever, or *perpetually*,” which is an indirect way of engaging that he shall not again run away.

16. οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον, &c., “no longer as a slave (only) but more, even a brother.” There is great address and delicacy in the added words ἀγαπητὸν—Κυρίῳ.

17. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ἔχεις—ἐμέ. The best Commentators are agreed that κοινωνὸς here (like the Hebr. רֵעַ in Prov. 28, 24. and Is. 1, 23.) signifies a *friend*; q. d. “If I am worthy of participating in your confidence as a friend.” Προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμὲ “show this confidence to Onesimus, and receive me, with kindness.” See note on ver. 12.

18. εἰ δὲ τι ἡδίκησέ σε ἢ ὀφείλει, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγει. The Apostle now assails him on the side of *interest*. From the words εἰ δὲ τι ἡδίκησε—ὀφείλει, Grot. and many moderns infer that he had been guilty of *robbery* as well as desertion. But I agree with the recent Commentators, that the terms will scarcely authorise us to suppose this. Ἠδικ. may not only apply to the having wronged his master by depriving him of his services during his absence, or perhaps by idleness before. What the Apostle means by the ὀφείλει, is not easy to determine. It would seem a strange term to use with reference to any money Onesimus had robbed his master of. Though some consider it as an *euphemism*. Most recent Commentators, as Benson and Heinr., think that he had somehow contracted debts, which his master had been obliged to pay. It would, however, be desirable to have some *evidence* on this matter, which the *Civilians* might furnish us with; though, as to Grot., he here fails, as being on another scent. If it were worth while to hazard a conjecture, I would suggest, that possibly Onesimus, when he absconded, might have procured himself provisions, &c. in his master's name.

18. τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγει, i. e. literally “reckon that in the account between us as an item for me to pay.” So Theophyl.: ἐμοὶ εἰς χρέος τοῦτο λόγισαι, ἐμὲ ἔχε ὠφειλέτην.

19. ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ, “For greater

certainly, take my engagement; I Paul (do hereby) write with my own hand, I will repay it." So οἰκειο-
χείρος ἀσφαλείαι, in Pachym. L. 6, 26. and αἰχειόχειρος
in Ducange Gloss. Græc. Commentators are not
agreed whether this denotes that the Apostle wrote
the *whole letter* with his own hand, or only *this por-
tion*; as Jerome thinks. Some Commentators here
dwell on the *generous magnanimity* of the Apostle;
while others recognise any thing but a serious en-
gagement. The latter opinion is countenanced by
the *antients*: but the truth probably lies in the me-
dium. The words following seem too serious to per-
mit us to entirely adopt the latter opinion.

19. ἵνα μὴ λέγω. Benson paraphrases thus: "Though
I do not say that, if we were to balance accounts,
you owe me this, and even your own self besides."
Notwithstanding what Benson says, it should seem
that Philemon had been personally converted by
Paul. Rosenm. here compares Simplic. on Epict.
37. Τροφεῖς οὗτοι καὶ ἐπιμέλῃται οὐ τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν,
αὐτῶν εἰσι. The πρὸς in προσοφ. has much force;
though in general προσοφ. signifies *to owe in arrear*.

20. ναὶ—Κυρίω, "Do (Ν), brother, grant that I
may enjoy this from thee, as a Christian (as from
thy conversion)." See the examples of ον. adduced
by Hypke and Wets. Ἀνάπαυσόν—Κυρίω. The
sense of this clause is obscure, and variously ex-
plained. It plainly means, "grant my request,"
and may be best rendered, "gratify my heart (see
the note supra, ver. 7) in this matter connected with
the religion of Christ."

21. πεποιθὼς τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου ἔγραψά σοι. Benson and
others take ὑπακοῇ in the sense *compliance*. But I
prefer the more usual signification *obedience*, viz. to
the precepts of the Gospel, which would secure his
compliance in the matter. Εἰδὼς ὅτι—ποιήσεις. The
Apostle's meaning is not clear. Some think this
hints that he should *manumit* Onesimus. Others
recognize no such meaning. At all events the de-

licacy of the Apostle has here, as often elsewhere, effectually prevented our arriving at any certainty.

22—25. *ξενίαν, a lodging.* Heinr. observes that this only imports lodging, and does not include *board*: for *τράπεζαν* is not, with Ros. and others, to be supplied. See, however, the note on Acts 28, 23. *Διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν*, can require no explanation to the readers of St. Paul. *Χαρισθ.* is an elegant mode of expression. With respect to the salutations, they require no explanation. They are similar to those at the close of the Colossians: and Rosenm. refers to Storrs's illustrations on that Epistle. On the *μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*, compare 2 Tim. 4, 22. and the note.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAP. I.

VER. 1. πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατέσιν ε. τ. π. For unaffected dignity and simple grandeur this proeme can hardly be equalled by any thing to be found in *Scripture* (certainly nothing in the *Classics*).

Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως. It is not agreed on by the Commentators whether these terms are to be *distinguished*, or regarded as *synonymous*. The former opinion is chiefly adopted by the antients and earlier moderns; the latter, by the more recent Commentators. Considering that St. Paul (for I take it for granted, and it has, I think, been satisfactorily *proved*, that he wrote this Epistle) seldom uses words in vain, or, like the Classical writers, merely elegantiæ gratia, the *former* opinion seems the more probable; though, from our imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, we can scarcely expect to fully comprehend such nice distinctions. Hence those who *maintain the distinction*, differ in opinion. (See Whitby and Ernesti.) The best founded one seems to be, that πολυμερῶς has reference to the many *parts* of the prophecies, or to the various *times* at which God revealed his will, and also various *places*; πολυτρόπως, to the different *modes* of revealing it, i. e. by voice, appearance, visions nocturnal or diurnal, Urim and Thummim, &c. See, however, Mackn. In illustration of these words there is an

able note of Schoettg. Hor. Hebr.; a work which, on this Epistle, ought to be perpetually consulted; though from it my limits forbid me to introduce so much matter as I could wish.

Λαλήσας. This word is in Scripture (especially in St. John) used chiefly of *address* for the purpose of religious instruction. See Schleus. Lex. τοῖς πατρᾷσιν, אבות, "our ancestors." Article for pronoun. As to the ἡμῶν of some MSS., it is a gloss. Ernesti remarks on the coincidence, in this respect, of the Hebrew and Greek, as a vestige of the Oriental origin of the Greek language. Ἐν, ב, *by*. So Theophyl., διὰ Προφῆταις, "Divinely commissioned and inspired legates." Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμέρων, i. e. (as Schoettg. explains) of the Jewish state, in which it was predicted the Messiah should appear. Ἐν υἱῷ, "by his Son." This Rosenm. observes, is to be closely united with the words following ὃν ἔθηκε, &c.

2. ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων. Theophyl. well explains: τοῦ κόσμου πάντος Κυρίον, i. e. all nations, not Israel only. "He so calls him (adds Theophyl.) by way of showing τοῦ τῆς υἰότητος γνήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον. And so the best moderns, who explain the κλ. *dominum* (for, it may be observed, *heirship* implies *lordship* and *proprietorship*. See Gal. 4, 1.); comparing the Hebr. יורש. See Gesen. Hebr. Lex. Rosenm. says, Christ is so called, because he preserves and governs the world. But even Crell. goes much further, whom see ap. Whitby.

The philological Commentators remark on the use here of τιθέναι for ποιεῖν. It is, however, a stronger term, and is well rendered *constitute, appoint*. Δι' οὗ Grot. and some others would render "proper quem;" fancying an allusion to the Jewish opinion, that the world was made *for the Messiah*. But this is entangling ourselves with Rabbinical fancies very needlessly; and since we are told at Joh. 1, 5. that all things were made up by the Logos, or Messiah,

we can be at no loss to perceive the sense of the Apostle, who also says the same thing at Col. 1, 15—17. See Whitby and Abp. Magee's Illustr. No. 1., and also Ernesti. Τοὺς αἰῶνας, the world, τὰ πάντα, or the universe; the plural being used to express *vastness* and *infinity*. Rosenm. remarks that αἰὼν. signifies, 1. a long time; 2. eternity; 3. in the N. T. *the world*, (like the Hebr. עוֹלָם), from its perpetual duration. See Dindorf in loc. and Carpzov, p. 12.

3. ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, “who being the effulgence of his glory, and the express exemplar, and delineation of” &c. Ernesti observes, that ἀπαύγασμα properly denotes the light, or rays reflected from a lucid body; and that δόξης is (by a Hebraism) put to denote the *Divine majesty*, the most excellent of his attributes. And he compares Sapient. 7, 26. ἀπαύγασμα αἰδίου, εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ; also Philo. p. 221. where, speaking of a sanctuary, he says: ἀπαύγασμα τῶν ἁγίων (of heaven) μίμημα τοῦ ἀρχετυποῦ. With respect to the χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, this is nearly of the same sense with the preceding. For χαρακτὴρ, which the Lexiographers and Glossographers explain by ὁμοίωσις, signifies properly a *mark* engraven upon any thing, as on a seal, or die, for coining; 2. the image (whether in wax, or melted metal, &c.), so obtained, which therefore must represent the exact *similitude* of the *archetype*. So that the sense is, “such an exact image of the Divine majesty, that he who seeth him, seeth the Father.” So Chrys. explains it: τὸ ὅμοιον εἶναι κατὰ πάντα, κατ’ οὐσίαν. See also the elaborate explanation of Theophyl. Here Casaub. aptly cites Col. 1, 15., where Christ is called the εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ.

3. φέρων τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, “Having sustained and preserved the universe by the powerful fiat of his word or will.” So the best Interpreters render. Φέρων, like the Hebr. נָשָׂא, here signifies *to bear* (up), ἀναφέρω. So Chrys.:

κυβερνῶν, τὰ διαπίπτοντα συγκρατῶν. And so Philo 1024. γένος φέρειν. Munthe observes that τὰ πάντα, to denote *the universe*, is often used by the Greek Philosophers. Ῥῆμα τῆς δυνάμεως is for ῥῆμα δυνατὸν, *powerful fiat*. Ἐαυτοῦ, *his own*. Others read αὐτοῦ. But the former, which is found in most MSS. and Chrys., is well defended by Mich., Braun, and Heinr. Δι' ἑαυτοῦ. This is emphatical. "By *himself*," i. e. by the sacrifice of his own death, and not by that of victims and sacrifices; as 9, 26. διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ & 12. διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. The ποιησάμενος καθαρισμὸν signifies, "having made expiation," for καθάρισας. So ποιεῖν λύτρωσιν, Luke 1, 68.

3. ἐκάθισεν—ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, "seated himself, sat down, at the right hand (of the majesty of the Father) in the highest." Καθ. is properly a reflected verb, signifying to *place* or *seat oneself*, to *sit*. So the Heb. יָשַׁב. The expression *sitting at the right hand of*, is also found in the Classical writers, figuratively of holding a rank next to a monarch. See Matt. 20, 21. But when used in the New Testament of *Christ*, it always implies participation in the government, and equality of rank; as in the case of the sons of Roman Emperors associated in the imperial dignity, who were called συνθρόνοι. Hence βασιλεύειν, θρόνος, &c. are ascribed to Christ. See Ps. 110, 1. 1 Cor. 15, 25. A proof of his *Divinity*. See Knapp Diss. de Christo ad dextram Dei sedente.

Μεγαλωσύνης Πῶς signifies, with the δόξα preceding, *majesty*, abstract for concrete. Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, scil. μέρεσι, i. e. in the highest heaven. So Ernesti.

4. τοσοῦτω κρείττων—ὄνομα. At πόσῳ and ὅσῳ subaud ἐν and μέτρῳ. Here γενόμενος is for ὦν. Dindorf, however, renders it *redditus, effectus*. And Abresch observes that it depends upon ἐκάθισεν. Κρείττων, *dignior, potior, præstantior*. Often used by the Classical writers of *Gods*. Διαφορώτερον, *more excellent*; as 8, 6., and often in the Classical writers. Ὄνομα, i. e. not *name*, but *dignity*. For the Apostle means not to prove the dignity ascribed to Christ

from the name *Son* ; but from his *dignity* he proves Christ to be infinitely greater than the angels. The Jews, it may be observed, attributed one principal force and authority to the law, that it was promulgated by the ministry of angels. (See Acts 7, 53. and Gal. 3, 19.) Hence the comparison of Christ with angels. Thus the Apostle shows that Christ is *King, Lord, and Creator* of all things, and the angels are but *ministers*. See Tittm. Op. Theol. p. 231. (Rosenm.) See the excellent note of Doddr.

Ernesti remarks on this rare use of *παρὰ* preceded by a comparative. It answers to the Heb. *וְ* and our *than*. *Κεκληρονόμηκεν*. The sense of *inheritance* is here, as often in the New Testament and Sept. (2 Kings 21, 15.), dropped. So the Heb. *לְ*. The perfect, too, is for the present, *possesseth, hath*.

5. *τίμι γὰρ—γεγέννηκά σε*. The interrogation implies a strong negation, i. e. to *no* one. This expression (Ernesti observes), the Apostle rightly explains of the eternal generation of the Son of God ; and it is wrongly taken by the Socinians of the generation of the resurrection ; who appeal to Acts 13, 32., where, however, *ἀνάστησας Ἰησοῦν* signifies *Jesu dato*." Thus Ern. would render : "*constituens Jesum servatorem ;*" and the whole passage thus : "*Tu Jesu Messiae es filius meus, h. e. non es solum homo, sed idem es Deus, quem ab æterno generavi.*" *Σήμερον* denotes *eternity*. See the note on Acts 13, 22., and consult Tittm. Op. Theol. 231., who rightly observes, that the whole of Ps. 2. is to be understood and explained of the *Messiah*, as the best Jewish Interpreters have invariably done, as Abarbanel, &c. (See Whitby) ; i. e. though it might be fulfilled, in a certain sense, in *David*, yet, in a mysterious and far sublimer sense, it belonged to Christ. And this seems the safe middle point, the *μέτρον ἀριστὸν*, between the two extremes, of supposing this, and such like passages, to belong *only* to the *Messiah*, or *only* to *David*. Mackn. well remarks on the propriety of

pressing on the Jews arguments of which *they* acknowledged the validity.

Πάλιν, *elsewhere*; as Matt. 4, 7. Rom. 15, 10. The εἰς is taken, by Rosenm., to denote, not *similarity*, but *reality*. Grot. renders it *in the place of*. And Abresch takes it for *dativus commodi*. It seems, however, to be a Hebrew idiom formed on the use of ה; though vestiges of it are found in the Latin. With respect to the words themselves, the best Commentators are agreed that they are taken from 2 Sam. 7, 14. Sept.; the phrase standing for αὐτοῦ. So Dindorf. See Pierce and Mackn.

6. ὅταν δὲ πάλιν—οἰκουμένην.

There is here, Rosenm. observes, either a transposition, or the πάλιν may (with Heinr.) be taken to signify *contra*. Doddr., Mackn., and Dindorf, render “when he again,” &c. But the first mode of interpretation seems the best founded. On the sense of εἰσαγ. εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην modern Commentators differ in opinion. See Abresch and Dindorf. Chrys. explains: ὅταν ἐγγχείριση αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκουμένην. But this is a very harsh and unauthorized hypallage. The two most probable opinions are, 1st, that it denotes *announces his advent, sistit, producit, palam proponit*. See 10, 5. 2dly, *ostendit, commendandi causâ*. So Heinr. and Dindorf. But I agree, with Ernesti, that the former (which is the common interpretation) deserves the preference; and it has this advantage, that it may, in some measure, *include* the other. Schleus. compares Polyb. : εἰσαγάγοντας αὐτοὺς Αὐτονίου τοῦ δημάρχου.

The πρωτότοκος (as the article shows) is a common designation for the *Messiah*. See Ps. 89, 20. compared with Rom. 8, 29. Οἰκουμένην, by metonymy, stands for *the inhabitants of the world*.

6. καὶ προσκυνήσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ. Some think these words are from Deut. 32, 43., where after εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ the Sept. has the very same: and the beginning of the verse is applied to the Messiah at Rom. 15, 9 & 10. But as the words in question are not found in the *Hebrew*, others (as Rosenm.) think them an insertion from Ps. 97, 7., where we have προσκυνήσετε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ: and in that Psalm the kingdom of Christ is foretold. Indeed, Kimchi says that all the Psalms from 93 to 101. contain the mystery of the Messiah. Rosenm. observes that that Psalm

may as properly be understood of God the Son as God the Father; since what is ascribed to the latter cannot but be applicable to the former; the Father having given the Son dominion; especially as the subject is the abolition of idolatry, and the introduction and universal propagation of true religion, of which Christ is the author. See Phil. 2, 9—11. With respect to the argument of inferiority, deduced from *worship*, it is irrefragable.

7. καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, “And, as regards the angels, he saith (of them).” By *He* is meant, literally, the Divine inditer, or inspirer of Scripture. The Commentators subaud ἡ γραφή (as 2 Cor. 6, 2. Gal. 3, 16. Eph. 4, 5., where see the notes), which is *supplied* at 1 Tim 5, 18. This comes to the same thing; but the literal sense must be attended to, as pointing at the *inspiration* of the Old Testament. This idiom occurs in the Rabbinical writers. With respect to the words themselves, they are from Ps. 104, 4. Πρὸς, *in reference to*, or *concerning*; as 4, 13. Ὁ ποιῶν—φλόγα. It has been debated what is here the subject; τοὺς ἀγγέλους and τοὺς λειτουργοὺς, or πνεύματα and πυρὸς φλόγα? Most recent Commentators adopt the latter opinion, taking πνεύματα to mean *winds*; as Job 3, 10., and elsewhere. And this, Whitby observes, agrees better with the πυρὸς φλόγα following, and with Ps. 104, 4., from whence the words are taken. The argument, they say, is this: “There is nothing great in the name of angels and ministers, since the Scripture gives those names to the winds and the lightning (infinitely inferior to Christ); for all *creatures* used by God, extra ordinem, come under that name.” (See Whitby and Pierce.) But this is manifestly harsh and far-fetched. And I agree, with Ernesti, that the former, which is the common interpretation, is far more natural, and more suitable to the context (see Mackn.); it is also supported by the Jewish Interpreters.

8. πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, sub. λέγει ἡ γραφή. Ps. 45, 7 & 8.

“ But concerning, or respecting the Son,” &c. “ A passage (observes Rosenm.) interpreted of the Messiah by many Jewish Commentators, and the Chaldee Paraphrast.” The δὲ is here *adversative*, like ἄλλα, *on the contrary*. Ὁ Θεός. Nominative for Vocative; as in the Hebrew. In which idiom the article loses its proper force, and stands for the ה. The Atticism is a vestige of Oriental phrasology. Our O seems derived from it.

8. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, “ for ages of ages,” i. e. for ever. On this phrase see Schleus. Lex. Vet. & Nov. Test. The ἐστὶ some render *will be*. But that is not necessary. Θρόνος is, as Theophyl. observes, a βασιλείας σύμβολον; for that implies *government*, as does also ῥάβδος. The εὐθύτης is the *genitive* for the cognate adjective; q. d. “ most right and just is thy government.” Some would render (as Grot., Rosenm., and Wakef.), “ God is thy throne,” by metonymy; as God is said to be a *rock*, i. e. the author of security. But this is very harsh and unnatural; and, as Wets. observes, is a phrase unknown in Scripture.

9. ἠγάπησας, &c. The best Commentators are agreed that the Aorist is here (as often) used of what is *customary*: though the *present* is more frequent. Ernesti compares the similar use of the Heb. preterite. The sense, then, is: “ Thou art a lover of righteousness, and a hater of iniquity.” Rosenm. renders δικαιοσύνην *causam boni*; and ἀνομίαν, *causam mali*; comparing Ex. 2, 13. 13, 7. Num. 35, 31. And so Hardy, Slade, and Wells, “ equity and justice.” (See Wells ap. Slade.)

9. διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισε σε ὁ Θεός—σου. In the ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως there is an evident allusion to the anointing of Kings, Prophets, and Priests; and, by a well known Oriental metaphor, it denotes *dignity, happiness, and glory*. See Ernesti, Rosenm., and the Antiquaries. The application is obvious. See the Commentators. *Who* are meant by the μετόχους is not certain. Rosenm. and Dindorf explain it,

“reges cœvi et terrestres, Messiæ longè inferiores.”* Others, as Dodd., *the angels*. Which seems not improbable. Beza, Camerar., Pisc., Wolf, and Ernesti, understand *the faithful*, who are themselves partakers in the Divine benefits. This I prefer; though it is liable to abuse.

It is of most importance, however, to attend to the ἔχρισε σε ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός σου, which I am surprised our venerable Translators should have rendered, “God, even thy God; hath anointed thee;” since, from the verse preceding, it is evident that the former ὁ Θεός is a vocative; as it was taken by Chrys. and Theophyl., who explain: ὁ Θεός, τουτέστιν, ὦ Θεέ, ἔχρισε σε ὁ Θεός.† And so Pisc. and some other early moderns, and, of the recent Commentators, Wolf, Ernesti, and Slade, which last truly observes, that the two passages thus construed convey a direct assertion of the Divinity of the Son.

10. καὶ—οἱ οὐρανοί, “And (further) thou, Lord,” &c. from Ps. 102, 26—28. Sept.; a comparison of which with the Hebrew see in Tittm. Op. Theol. 243. Κατ’ ἀρχὰς is for πάλαι, which would have better represented the sense of the לְפָנֶיךָ. Ἐθεμελίωσας, *created*; by a metaphor derived from building, and here adopted agreeably to the popular opinion of the earth being a plain surface, erected on massy foundations. Ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν. Ernesti regards the τῶν χειρῶν as pleonastic; but it is a stronger expression; *hand*, in Hebrew, denoting *power*, in which (from the nature of God) are also *implied* the *other* attributes of wisdom and goodness.

11. αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται—παλαιωθήσονται. For δαιμόνεις some MSS. and Versions read διαμενεῖς. But that seems to have arisen from emendation: the present, the Critics observe, being put for the future. Yet

* But that proceeds upon a contracted view of the Psalm, which even Pearce acknowledges was undoubtedly meant of the Messiah, and *not* (as some regard it) a mere *epithalamium* on Solomon’s marriage with Pharaoh’s daughter.

† Euseb. cites ὁ Θεέ, which is evidently a gloss.

the present, which is the *tempus indefinitum*, is here highly suitable, as used of a Being whose duration is unconnected with time. Besides, it is required by the εἶ at ver. 12. Ἀπολούνται is explained by the antients μετασχηματισθήσονται ἐκ τῆς νῦν ὕψους. (See Theophyl.) And so Abresch, who refers to the verses following, and to 2 Pet. 3, 10—13. The πάντες refers both to the οὐρανοὺς and the τῆς γῆς.

12. καὶ—ἀλλαγήσονται. The καὶ is rendered by Ernesti *et cum*. I prefer *for*. Περιβόλαιον denotes that ample *cloak* called the *hyke*, which the Orientals throw over their dress. Under which similitude the *sky*, or *heaven* is represented; since that is the idea in the Heb. עֲרֵב (whence our old word *rack*, used by Shakspeare). Ἐλίξεις, *wilt fold up, and lay aside*; for, as the Commentators remark, we fold up cast clothes. As to the reading ἀλλάξεις, though found in some MSS., and defended by the Hebr., it is rightly rejected by the Critics. Καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται, i. e. will be changed into the “new heavens” spoken of at 2 Pet. 3, 13.

12. σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, “But thou sufferest no such change, but art always the same.” Rosenm. compares Deut. 32, 39. “See now, that I, even I am he, נִהְיֶה. And Philo 458. (cited by Carpzov), says that the sun never changes, but remains αὐτὸς. I would add, that the Greeks used this figuratively; as Thucyd. 3, 38., Ἐγὼ ὁ αὐτὸς εἰμι, where I shall adduce many examples.

The next clause seems exegetical, or may be a parallelism. It is plain that years are said of God, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς; though, as Rosenm. observes, to say “they shall not *fail*,” is equivalent to calling Him immortal.

13. πρὸς τίνα—ποδῶν σου. From Ps. 110., Sept. The interrogation implies a strong negative; q. d. “God never makes *angels* συμβασιλεύειν; they are rather his *servants*.” In the κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου there is an allusion, such as I noted at ver. 2., to the custom of Kings associating their sons with them in the

government, either temporarily, for a particular purpose (as the subduing of enemies); or for a continuance. The nature of the βασιλ. is explained at 1 Cor., 15, 25. In the words ἕως ἐάν—σου we are not to seek refinements. They are said κατ' ἀνθρώποπαθείαν, and have an allusion to the Oriental custom.

14. οὐχὶ πάντες—σωτηρίαν. The argument is continued. "Are not (these angels) all (but) ministering spirits deputed by God to assist those who shall be heirs of salvation, and not to be compared with Christ, who requires not their services." Λειτουργικά, i. e. τῷ Θεῷ. The term λειτουργ. is used of any service or office; but was especially applied to *Divine* services, as of Priests, who were styled δοῦλοι Θεοῦ; and, therefore, is very applicable to *angels*. These are here described as πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα, i. e. of no self-derived dignity, but solely of deputed authority. And the Apostle adds (as Theophyl. observes), in order to raise the minds of his hearers, and show God's care of us, that angels so superior to us are deputed, διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, where Rosenm. observes, σωτηρίαν must not be understood of eternal salvation, but only of assistance in perils and necessities. But that is too bold an interpretation, and unwarranted by the context: for if nothing more than this were meant, there would be something frigid in κληρον., &c. It seems best to take σωτηρία in its most extensive sense, of the welfare of men, both in this world, and in the next.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. Dindorf thinks that ver. 1—5. are parenthetical, and meant to admonish the Hebrews to cultivate faith and steadfastness in the Christian doctrine. Abresch justly objects to the division of the Chapter here, since that is closely connected with the preceding; and the division ought (he thinks)

to have taken place at ver. 4. This (I add) is supported by the authority of Chrys., who commences a new Homily at ver. 5.

1. διὰ τοῦτο—παράρρῳαμεν, “wherefore (such being the super-angelic and supreme dignity of Christ) we ought the more studiously to attend to the doctrine we have received from him in the Gospel, lest we let it slip.” Περισσοτερῶς, the more earnestly and studiously. The περισσοτερῶς shows the real, though latent, meaning of the Apostle, which (as Theophyl. remarks) is, to hint, from the infinite superiority of Christ to the angels, who were the promulgators of the Law, that they ought τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦτο λαληθεῖσι προσέχειν περισσοτέρως τοῦ νόμου. The terms περισσοτέρως and προσέχειν, scil. τὸν νοῦν, must both be taken *intensively*, and *emphatically*, and import studious attention, obedience to, and firm constancy in. At ἀκουσθεῖσι, must be supplied ῥήμασι.

On the sense of the μὴ πότε παρὰρρῳαμεν Commentators are not agreed. It is copiously treated on by Dindorf. Most antients, and some moderns, interpret, “lest we should slip from them,” i. e. they (and the salvation they announce), should slip from us, and we perish. So Chrys.: ἐμπέσωμεν, ἀπολώμεθα. And so also the Syr. and Arabic. And this interpretation is learnedly defended and illustrated by Abresch, who adduces examples from Eph. Syr.; and Clem. Alex. Many specious objections to it, however, are urged by Dindorf, who would abandon the sense *fail and perish*; and he explains, with the English Commentators, “let slip from our minds.” So the E. V. But the context seems to require the interpretation above detailed, which is supported by Hamm., Whitby, and Slade. On the exact *ratio metaphoræ* there may be some uncertainty: but the above, I conceive, is the sense intended.

2. ἐν γὰρ—βέβαιος. Another argument for obedience to the Gospel; since the contempt of it will bring greater punishment than that of the Law of Moses. (Dindorf.)

The sense of ὁ λόγος Dindorf has copiously treated on. After all, I agree with Rosenm., that the context sufficiently shows the λόγος to signify the *Mosaic Law*. On the δι' ἀγγέλων λαλ., see the notes on Acts 7, 53., and Gal. 3, 19., and consult the admirable notes of Whitby, here, and on 9, 5. Βέβαιος ἐγένετο Rosenm. explains, "valorem accepit, ita ut nemo impunè eam transgredi posset." So it is said of the Gospel, Rom. 4, 16. Παράβασις, like פְּרָעָה, signifies transgression of a law, or command. Παρακοή, *disobedience*. But the nature of the term may imply *contempt* and *contumacy*. See Deut. 32, 35. Μισθός and μισθοδοσία are, like many similar words in all languages, terms of middle signification, and may denote either reward, or punishment, the latter, *ironicè*. To the illustrations of the Commentators I add Eurip. Or. 833., πατρώων παθέων ἀμοιβάν, where the Scholiast explains ἐκδίκησιν. Æschyl. Theb. 1023., τοῦπιτίμιον λαβεῖν, *mercedem*, τιμωρίαν. Hor. Carm. 3, 24, 24. et peccare nefas, aut pretium emori.

3. πῶς ἡμεῖς—σωτηρίας;

How shall we escape this ἐκδικὸν μισθοδοσίαν, if we neglect (to lay hold of) so great a *means of salvation*;" for such may be the sense of τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας; though Grot. and Rosenm. think that λόγου is to be supplied, i. e. "a doctrine which brings all such salvation." There is, it may be observed, a tacit comparison between the temporal σωτηρία of the Law, i. e. (as Theophyl. says) deliverance from their enemies, and the enjoying the good of the Law, and the *eternal salvation* held out by the Gospel. (See Chrys.) Dindorf takes σωτ. for *the Christian religion*. But that is not necessary. The terms ἐκφεύγω and ἀποφεύγω (he observes) are often used, with or without an added noun of condemnation or punishment, to denote *acquittal*; as Rom. 2, 3., ἐκφ. τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἀμελήσαντες is a *mild* term, under which a stronger sense is couched: and Glass, Abrsch, and Dindorf, remark on the κοίνωσις, so usual with St. Paul.

3. ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα—ἐβεβαιώθη, "which having been at the beginning promulgated by our Lord himself, was firmly testified, and communicated to us by those who heard it." The phrase ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν is often used in the later writers, from whom Wets. adduces examples. But propriety required τοῦ λα-

λείσθαι. The εἰς ἡμᾶς is for ἡμῖν; as in 1 Pet. 1, 25. A frequent idiom, derived from the Hebrew use of ל. Theophyl. well annotates on the whole verse thus: Τὸ ἀξιόπιστον ἐπάγων, φησὶν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία αὕτη οὐ διὰ προφητῶν ἢ ἀγγέλων ἐλαλήθη, ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ δεσπότου πάντων, ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς πηγῆς ἔσχε τὴν ἀρχὴν· εἶτα διεπορθμεύθη καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως καὶ πιστῶς δι' αὐτῶν τῶν αὐτοπτῶν τοῦ λόγου καὶ ὑπηρετῶν. There has, however, been some difference of opinion on the force of the ἐβεβ. which some moderns, as Carpzov and Rosenm., take not in the sense *confirm*, but simply *pervenire*. But this is destitute of all authority, and is not to be supported by an etymological derivation of βεβαίως from βαίνω, as if it received the sense of *confirm*, "quia fama crescit eundo." (See Rom.) It is more correct to say that βεβαιόω comes from βεφαίως, and that from βαίνω, *to go*; q. d. something *to go upon*, trust-worthy; a metaphor taken from passage over marshes, or ice. But this is no support to such a frigid fancy. Abresch, Heinr., and Dindorf, rightly consider ἐβεβ. as a vox prægnans for ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαία. And so Ernesti and Morus. But I rather prefer the explanation of Theophyl. above cited.*

Certainly there was no reason for any to infer from the *we*, that St. Paul could not be the writer of this Epistle; since he derived his knowledge of that from our *Lord himself*. The best Commentators are agreed, that there is here a *κοινωνίς*, and that the Apostle (as often) speaks *communicativè*, and only means the *Hebrews*, whom he is addressing. For

* Dindorf also refers to Glass Ph. Sacr. 1, 195., and further remarks: "Acutissimè et rectissimè Michaelis in notis ad Vers. germ. ἐβεβαιώθη diversum esse ab eo animadvertit, quod in versu seg. de confirmatione Evangelii, per portenta et miracula dixit, quæ ἀσφαλείαν divinam efficiant, cùm hic de humana sermo sit, quæ in eo cernitur, quod testes ea quæ auribus perceperant, cùm bona fide aliis traderent." The whole praise of acuteness and rectitude of interpretation must, however, whatever it be, be given to Theophyl., from whom it was borrowed.

these had derived their knowledge from *others* who had been eye and ear witnesses. This mode of speaking is indeed very frequent in the *Classical* writers.

4. συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος—θέλῃσιν, “God (himself) bearing a further testimony (to the truth of their accounts) by signs and wonders, and various miracles and distributions of the Holy Spirit (imparted), according to his own will and pleasure.” Such is (I conceive) the true sense; though Carpzov and Dindorf will not allow the σὺν in συνεπ. to have any force: and I am aware that it is, in the Classical use, often very faint: yet I have seldom found that the Apostle uses even a Preposition in composition needlessly. I grant that the ἐπὶ cannot signify *magis*, but answers to the *ad* in *attestari*. On the σημ., τερ., and δυναμ., I have before treated. Indeed all the three terms occur at Acts 2, 22., δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, where see the note. When thus associated, it is needless to refine on each term; as do Whitby and Abresch. We may understand the accumulation of all the terms denoting supernatural works, as meant to express miracles of every kind and degree.

By the μερισμοῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου, are plainly denoted those *supernatural gifts* of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to some of the primitive Christians, in confirmation of the truth of the Gospel, and which are adverted to at Cor. 12, 13 & 14., where I have treated copiously on their nature, and shown their reality. The very terms μερισμοῖς and κατὰ τὴν θέλῃσιν, suggest (as the Commentators remark), that they were not given to *all*.

I would observe, that the striking similarity on this subject, between the phraseology here, and in the Epistles admitted to be St. Paul's, has not been sufficiently attended to; especially at 1 Cor., 12, 11., πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. See also Eph. 4, 7., 1 Cor. 17, 17., and elsewhere. The Apostle hints,

that as the evidence for the Gospel is so much more striking and indicative of Divine interposition than the Law, so it would be more inexcusable to neglect it.

5. οὐ γὰρ—λαλοῦμεν. The Apostle now returns to the subject he had before been treating on; and this verse connects with 1, 14. He adduces the reasons why the Angels were not permitted to have dominion over the human race; namely, since the dignity of man is in itself not much inferior to the condition of the Angels. (Rosenm.)

5. τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, “the times of the New Testament.” So termed in the style of the Prophets, who call this dispensation such symbolically. (Ernesti.) So Dindorf. Doddr. explains it of the kingdom of the Messiah, which extends not only to earth, but to heaven. See Whitby and Mackn. Slade thinks it probable that the phrase refers to the state of the Gospel here on earth; that being what the Apostle is speaking of (περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν). And he refers to Acts 7, 53., and Gal. 3, 19.

6. διεμαρτύρατο δὲ τοῦ τὶς, λέγων, *Testatur potius ille ipse divinus vates*, qui prædixit ea, quæ legimus Ps, 47. (Rosenm.) Carpzov and Rosenm. well remark on this (what to us appears) vague mode of citation. It is often, they say, used in Philo:* and this use of τὶς does not imply ignorance of the author (which indeed cannot be supposed in one so conversant as was St. Paul in such matters). It is in fact usual with the Rabbins: and Theophyl. observes: οὐ λέγει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀπόντος ἅτε πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιστήμονας τῶν διαλεγόμενος. (See also Chrys. and Œcumen.) Which is, I conceive, the best key to the explanation of this kind of citation.

The διὰ in διεμαρτύρατο has a slightly intensive force. The *parallelism* is here to be attended to: though the second member is slightly exegetical. Ὅτις ἀνθρώπου, i. e. **אדם בן**.

* I add Plutarch Anton. 66. ἀλλ', ὥσπερ τὶς παίζων εἶπε.

Bishop Middleton has here ably refuted the opinion of Pierce and Mich., who interpret this Psalm, not (as is commonly done) of Adam, but of the *Messiah alone*. צר נלה may be taken of Palestine only; and if our Lord does (Matt. 21, 15 and 16.) apply it to his own times; yet, though it may prove the *secondary*, it does not disprove the *primary* sense; nor do the τὰ πάντα necessarily refer to the angels; they need only be understood of those parts of creation just enumerated. "Of this, therefore (continues the learned Prelate), and many other passages in the antient prophecies, we may adopt the more usual interpretation, and understand them in a two-fold sense. If we reject a secondary sense, the multitude of applications, made by Christ and his Apostles, are fanciful and unauthorized, and wholly inadequate to prove the points for which they are cited; if we reject a primary sense, we must believe that many of the passages alluded to (with regard to the people and times for which they were originally designed) were merely allusions." Nothing can be more true than the remark; and its importance demands that it should be continually borne in mind by the Biblical student.

7. ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους. The Commentators are not agreed whether at βραχὺ τι there be an ellipsis of διάστημα, or χρόνου. Most Critics prefer the *latter*. But the Classical proofs adduced are but weak, and the ellipsis is not a little harsh. A *good sense*, indeed, may be made either way; but, according to the former, a more natural one (I think) will arise. See the able note of Dindorf.

The other terms require little explanation. Στεφανώω, as Rosenm. observes, signifies properly to *give any one the palm*, declare him victor; and hence, in a general way, *ornare*. So Philostr. V. Ap. 1, 11. s. m. οἱ θεοὶ—στεφανώσαντες, οὐ χρυσοῖς στεφανοῖς, ἀλλ' ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσιν.

8. πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. The Apostle proceeds to draw arguments from the above cited passage. The πάντα may very well extend to the several classes of brute creatures mentioned at ver. 7 and 8 of the Psalm, πρόβατα καὶ βοάς, &c. So Middl. and Ros., the latter of whom compares Gen. 1, 26 and 27.; observing, that hence appears the dignity of man over the other creatures. Yet I agreed with Bp. Middleton, that as πάντα may include all things without exception, angels as well as

men; what proves the secondary sense, will not disprove the primary.

8. ἐν γὰρ τῷ—ὑποτεταγμένα. By the *he* is, as Rosenm. truly observes, meant the *author of the Psalm*, and not God. And he adds, that poets are often said to do what they represent others to have done; as in Hor. Sat. 1. Poeta jugulat Memnonem. I add Thucyd. 1, 10. πεποιήκε γὰρ χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων νεῶν, where I shall adduce numerous other examples.

Ἀνυπότακτος signifies either “one who *is not to be* subjected;” or, one who *is not* subjected; as here. Of both senses Abresch produces examples.

8. νῦν δὲ οὕτω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα. Rosenm. explains thus: “Sensus est, illa verba Psalmi in nullo hominum plenum effectum habuisse. Nam utimur quidem rebus creatis, sed non omnia nobis subjecta sunt. Utimur e. c. pecoribus, verum sæpe etiam a pecoribus violamur. Nunc autem ostendit Paulus v. g. seqq. id, quod de nullo homine strictè dici possit, id de Christo solo dici strictissimo sensu posse. Ergo locus Psalmi, qui litteraliter de homine agit, nunc ad Jesum transfertur. Summa rei est: Deus non angelum quendam, sed hominem facere voluit Dominum. Sed non nisi unus homo est, qui verissimè et strictissimè dominus *omnium* dici possit.”

9. τὸν δὲ—θανάτου. The construction and sense are thus laid down by the best Critics: Ἰησοῦν δὲ βλέπομεν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανομένον, τὸν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττώμενον, ὅπως χάριτι, &c. “Him who was made a little lower than the angels for a short time, i. e. who took the human nature, even Jesus, we behold, on account of his having suffered death, crowned with glory and honour.” Bp. Middleton observes, that the subject is τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι—Ἰησοῦν, and the predicate is all which follows. The subjoined clause ὅπως, &c. (he adds) may be understood to contain the *reason why* Christ suffered death, as mentioned in διὰ τὸ πάθημα.

The words of the Psalm manifestly point at the

Divine author of our religion, and describe his state in the humiliation of his incarnation, and in the exaltation of his glory after he had accomplished the work of human redemption. Many novel opinions and interpretations on this verse are detailed and reviewed by Dindorf, which I leave in medio.

10. ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ—τελειῶσαι. Ratio redditur, cur Jesus per supplicium mortis ad breve tempus (paullulum) tenuior fuerit angelis, quia hoc maximè consentaneum fuisset consilio Dei, quod per Christum assequi voluisset, h. e. homines beare. (Rosenm.)

Ἐπρεπε Ernesti renders *debebat, oportebat*; as Hebr. 7, 16. I prefer (with Rosenm.) “was worthy of God; consistent with the Divine attributes; suitable to the wisdom of God and his counsels for our salvation.” So Doddr. takes the expression to signify, not only that the course he took was well worthy of God, but that in order to act worthy of himself, it was expedient that he should take this method.” Chrys. on Acts 3, 21. renders the expression ἀναγκὴ ἔστιν.

10. δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα. The best Commentators antient and modern are agreed that this signifies, “for whom and whose glory are all things, and through whom all things exist.” So Chrys. and Theophyl.: αὐτὸς αἷτιος πάντων, καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πάντα γίνεταί. This, Rosenm. observes, is a designation of the Supreme Being. Compare Rom. 11, 36. The ἀγαγόντα must be referred to the ἀρχηγὸν following. It signifies literally, “who was bringing,” or, *was to bring*. Dindorf, Grot., and Ernesti render “intended to bring.” Rosenm. observes, that it is synonymous with ἡγεμόνα, or ἀγωγέα, used by Philo of a *general*, and of Moses, *leader* of the people. By δόξαν is meant the *Christian* glory, i. e. salvation and happiness. This is just after interchanged with σωτηρίας. Πολλοὺς υἱούς. Said of all true Christians, as being (to use the words of the Apostle, 1 Pet. 1, 3.) “begotten again to a lively hope,” &c.

See also *infra* ver. 11. Ἀρχηγός signifies not only leader, but *author*. So Theophyl.: αἴτιον. And Rosenm. illustrates this from Dionys.: νόμων ἀρχηγ. Dindorf thinks it is an hendiadis for ἀρχ. καὶ σωτῆρ, Acts 5, 31. Carpzov cites from Philo: παλιγγενείας ἀρχηγρ. ἡμέρων. And he observes that ἀρχηγέτης is the more usual term. Other examples of this signification may be seen in the note of Blomfield on Æschyl. Ag. 250. where he rightly explains the term “*auctorem, non ducem.*”

The τελειωθῆναι is well explained by Rosenm.: ἀχθῆναι εἰς δόξαν, *ad felicitatis metam perductum, dominum summum constituisse*. The term signifies properly “to be brought to the end or goal, and enjoy the fruits of one’s labour;” as 12, 28. Phil. 3, 11. It is an agonistical metaphor. See Faber Agon. L. 3, 10. p. 255. Abresch. compares Philo 640. ψυχὴ τελειωθείσα ἐν ἀρετῶν ἀθλοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ὄρον αὐτὸν ἐφικομένη τοῦ καλοῦ. And Dindorf observes, that it is often so used in the Ecclesiastical writers. See Suic. Thes. &c. Some, as Michaelis, Semler, &c. interpret τελ. *consecrate, inaugurate*. But though that sense would not be inapposite, yet the common interpretation is more natural. See the excellent note of Whitby, who has shown that this is one among the many other proofs of the doctrine of the atonement. See also Wets. in loc.

11. ὁ,τε γὰρ—πάντες, “For he that expiates, and they who are expiated by him (the redeemer and the redeemed) are all of one.” Ἀγιάζειν here signifies to consecrate oneself to death, and die for the expiation of their sins, and thereby redeem them; as *infra*, 10, 10. Passages strongly discountenancing the Socinian tenets. (Ernesti.) The ἐξ ἑνὸς is by some (as Pierce, Wells, Mackn., and others,) explained of *Abraham*. And Rosenm. subauds γένους or σπέρματος (*the same nature*); which he thinks is confirmed by the following 5, 1. “It was fitting (says he) that the Author of salvation should be not an angel, but one endued with human nature.” Which is very true, but scarcely what the Apostle here

means. I prefer, with the antients and some moderns (as Limborch, Ernesti, Morus, Heinr., and Dindorf), to refer it to the *Father*; “we are all sons of one God; though in various ways.” Ὁ μὲν (says Theophyl.) ὡς γνήσιος υἱὸς, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, ἡμεῖς δὲ, ὡς κτίσματα.

On οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται Chrys. and other antients (and also Ernesti) remark, that this shows the superiority of Christ to the human nature. So Phot. ap. Œcumen. 330 c. Εἰπὼν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται, ἔδειξε τὸ διάφορον· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ἀδελφός, καὶ τοι ὦν ἀληθῶς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φιλανθρωπίαν, ἐπειδὴ ἐστὶ καὶ ἀληθῶς Θεός. See also Theodoret and Abresch.

12. ἀπαγγελῶ—ὑμνήσω σε. It is now shown, from some passages of the Old Testament, that the Messiah is not ashamed to call men his brethren. (Rosenm.) This is from Ps. 22, 23. and agrees in sense, though not in words, with the Sept.; διηγ. being used for ἀπαγγ. The ὄνομα Ernesti explains of God, and his perfections, acts, and benefits towards men. Dindorf observes, that the force of the proof turn on τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου. By the ἐκκλησ. is meant the *nation* congregated in the Temple of Jerusalem. The ἐν μέσῳ, Ernesti rightly remarks, is simply for *in, apud, inter*. And he renders: “in cœtu fidelium.” See his note, and Abresch.

Both the Jewish and the best Christian Interpreters are agreed that the Psalm is, upon the whole, meant for the *Messiah*. And therefore, though petty difficulties may be raised on certain passages, yet they are not such as to shake that opinion; neither is it necessary to resort to the common Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, that the Apostle argues *ex concessis*.

13. καὶ πάλιν Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ’ αὐτῷ. The passage is by some Commentators thought to be derived from Is. 8, 17. By others, from Ps. 18, 3.; especially (they think) as, from the repetition of the καὶ πάλιν, the two clauses cannot belong to the same passage: and though Whitby objects, that the words are not found in the Psalm, yet (they reply) they

are found in 2 Sam. 22, 3., of which it is nearly a copy. But many eminent recent Commentators urge a yet more fatal objection, that the Psalm contains no allusion to the Messiah. It is well observed by Dind. that the words differ so slightly from those of the passage of Isaiah, that no one would ever have doubted that they had been taken from thence, had it not been for the καὶ πάλιν, which made some fancy another passage was referred to, and they fixed on the *Psalm*. But Heins., Carpzov, Vitringa, and Rosenm. are agreed that the πάλιν may denote not different passages, but a continuation of the same passage. See their examples.

The force of the argument is obvious. By the τὰ πάντα are meant (as before) sons of God and Christ, and faithful disciples, whom God giveth to Christ to be *trained*. (Joh. 17, 22.)

14. ἐπεὶ οὖν—μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, “Since therefore the children (see ver. 13.) are partakers of flesh and blood, he also was made partakers of the same.” It is observed by Dindorf, that the παιδία supplied the Apostle an occasion of unfolding what he had just said.

Σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα is a common expression to denote the *human body* (as 2 Cor. 4, 11.), or the *human nature*; as here. Others combine a notion of affliction and frailty. But this seems precarious. See Ernesti. Τὰ παιδία properly denotes *little children*; but it is often used (as here) as a term of affection. Not dissimilar is the use of the Italian *diminutives*. Καὶ, so also. Παραπλησίως signifies not only in a similar manner, but *in the very same manner*. So Chrys.: οὐ φαντασία, οὐδὲ εἰκὼν, ἀλλὰ θεία. Many examples are adduced by the Philologists, the most apposite of which is Demosth. Olynth. 3. παραπλησίως καὶ ὁμοίως. And they might have added the passage from which that seems to have been imitated; namely, Thucyd. t. 1. 236. ὅμοια καὶ παραπλήσια.

Μετέσχε answers to κεκοινώνηκε. Both terms are explained *nanscisci, habere*. Yet there is an obvious

propriety and beauty in the terms, which signify more than *habere*. See Beausob. ap. Slade.

14. ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου—διάβολον, “that by his own death he might put down and deprive of his power him who had the power over death, namely, the Devil.”

We have here a refined and ænigmatical mode of expression, which all who have read Thucyd., Tacitus, and Sallust, will remember is perpetually found in those writers, and occasionally in the best Classical authors. Τοῦ θανάτου, “his own death.” Καταργ. must here mean “deprive of his power.” But the exact force of the sentence (which is expressed in a refined and somewhat obscure manner) has not been distinctly seen by the Commentators. It is plain that the expression κράτος ἔχειν τοῦ θανάτου cannot be used of the Devil, except *improprie*, and in a certain respect. On the force of the *allusion* Commentators differ. Some eminent moderns think the Apostle has reference to the common opinion among the Jews, that a certain evil angel presided over death, whom, from a misinterpretation of Prov. 16. 14. they called the *angel of death*, and to whom they assigned the name *Asmodeus*, or *Samael*. (See more in Grot., Rosenm., and Dindorf.) But it seems little probable that the Apostle would seriously allude to such a base and grovelling piece of superstition. I must assent to the antients, and most moderns, that there is an allusion to the *history of the fall* in Genesis, respecting which our Lord, Joh. 8, 44., says “the Devil was a murderer from the beginning.” And, as being the author of sin, and so of death also, (the latter being introduced by the former,) he may be said figuratively to have had the *power of death*, and that not only temporal, but *eternal*. (See Milton’s *Parad. Lost*, l. 1. init.) But by his own death our Lord (vanquishing, as Theophyl. says, the Devil by his own weapons), by offering himself up for the expiation of our sins, did thereby destroy the *cause* of eternal death even *sin*.

15. καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ—δουλείας. This adverts to another benefit of his death, namely, that faithful Christians were not only delivered from eternal death, but from an excessive *fear of death temporal*, which, without that hope, would have been intolerable. I would compare Arrian Epict. L. 3, 26. fin. κεφάλαιον τοῦτο πάντων τῶν κακῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἀγενείας καὶ δείλιας· οὐ Θάνατος ἐστὶ, μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ τοῦ θανάτου φόβος.

Rosenm. observes that at ἀπαλλάξῃ (a term used properly of liberation from servitude) we may supply φόβου from φόβῳ just after. Διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν is for διὰ πάσης ζωῆς; of which idiom the philological

Commentators furnish examples from Philo and other writers. Indeed, it is found in many good authors. Yet, from the examples adduced by Dindorf, as Ignat. ad Trall. c. 9. τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν· and Eph. c. 17. μὴ αἵχμαλωτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου ζῆν, it appears (as he says) to belong to later Græcisms.

Ἐνοχος (which comes from ἐνέχεσθαι, *to be held bound*) is here used in its primitive sense, *obnoxious, subject to*. So Theophyl. : κατέχεσθαι. By δουλ. is meant the slavish fear just spoken of.

16. οὐ γάρ δήπου—ἐπιλαμβάνεται. On the sense of these words some difference of opinion has always subsisted. The Greek Commentators and the Latin Fathers (including the Vulg.), and most moderns, render ἐπιλαμβ. *assumpsit, assumed our nature*. But the earlier Greek Fathers (as Ernesti says) explain it βοηθήσει, *protect, assist, redeem*. And this interpretation is adopted by Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Wells, Pierce, Pyle, Ernesti, Mackn., Rosenm., and the most eminent recent Commentators. See Ernesti Inst. Int. N. T. p. 201., and his valuable note on this passage. The present is used for the aorist. Ernesti shows that in the Classical writers ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι signifies to *lay hands on* any thing, to *help, assist, save*, &c. Either interpretation (he observes) is agreeable to the analogy of faith. Which, then, must be preferred? That which is agreeable to the usus loquendi and grammatical propriety, and suitable to the context." On *all* these accounts (he shows) the latter interpretation deserves the preference. And he refers to ver. 14 & 18., where for ἐπιλαμβ. is substituted βοηθήσαι. The same interpretation, too, is adopted by Rosenm., who, on the σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, *posterity of Abraham*, remarks : " Paulus, Hebræis scribens, satis habet de illis loqui ; de gentibus alibi loquendi locus. Saltim posterī Abrahami h. l. non sunt spectandi ut natio aliqua, sed opponuntur angelis."

17. ὅθεν ὤφειλε—τοῦ λαοῦ, " Whence (because he was their helper and redeemer) it behoved him to

be, in all things, make like unto his brethren." The ὁμοιωθῆναι signifies to *be the very same*. See the note supra, ver. 14. Abresch explains it ἰσοθῆναι. I would compare Artemid. On. 1, 13. αὐτῷ ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα. By the πάντα is meant in all those points connected with the infirmities and miseries of our nature, though being χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, 4, 15. So Hardy: "non solum quoad naturam, et conditionem; sed etiam passiones, res adversas, et ipsam mortem; i. e. in omnibus naturæ patibilis proprietatibus." ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται, "That he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest; *merciful*, as having himself experienced the feeling of human frailty and misery, and who therefore could not but be touched with mercy and sympathy." The πιστὸς some render *benign*, which seems to suit the preceding; but the common interpretation, *faithful* or *trust-worthy*, who rightly discharges his office, and to whom we may safely trust ourselves and our cause, is (I think) rightly preferred by almost all Commentators, ancient and modern. Dindorf says it may either mean *fidelis*, qui fidem præstat, or *fidus*, qui meretur fidem; as Macc. 14, 41. προφηταὶ πιστ. And so Carpzov. Dindorf, and Rosenm., however, prefer the exposition I have above laid down.

The ellipsis in τὰ πρὸς Θεὸν is trite. The words following are exegetical. Εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι, &c., "to expiate the sins of the people," i. e. the whole human race considered as one people. Grot. and Dindorf think there is an enallage derived from Hebraism, since it is more usual to say ἱλάσκεσθαι Θεὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. So the Hebrews use בָּלַע, עֲלִילָאָה, &c.; as in Ecclesiasticus. We may here compare Ps. 103, 3. and Dan. 9, 24. ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας.

18. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν—βοηθῆσαι. Dindorf observes that the ἐν ᾧ answers to the Heb. בְּאִשָּׁר, Angl. *inasmuch as*, quippe, propterea quod. It may be resolved into ἐν τούτῳ ὅ, or διὰ τούτου, &c. Πειρασθεὶς, *tried*, or put to the proof, i. e. by adversities and calamities. Δύναται. Ernesti observes that this imports not

merely *power*, or *possibility*, but also *will*, or willingness. So Theophyl.: *προθυμὸς ἐστὶν εἰς τὸ δοῦναι χεῖρα συμπαθείας.*

This and the preceding chapter Ernesti calls the *Scandalum Socinianorum*; and the learned Commentator lays down a summary of the Theological doctrines which may be proved from thence. The divinity and the humanity of Christ; the conjunction of both natures in one person; communication of the Divine *idiomata*; the two-fold state of Christ and his triple office. The whole treatise will well repay an attentive perusal; but my limits will only permit me to introduce the following on the *Divinity* of Christ. "This is defended and confirmed, I. From the Divine *names*, c. 1, 8. 9, 10., where he is styled Θεός. Now it is plain that the true God is meant; since the throne of Christ is said to be eternal, and his kingdom eternal. But *eternity* can only apply to *God*. By the *ἐλαιοι ἀγαλλιᾶσεως* are meant the *idiomata Divina*; therefore the subject is *the true God*. He is said, at ver. 10., to be Κύριος, which is a word often used by the Sept. to express the Heb. יהוה. Thus in the Psalm, at the beginning, there is יהוה, the name of the true God. But it must also appear from the *thing itself*. For he who created heaven and earth must necessarily be *truly* God, and not *in name only*. II. Another proof of the Divinity of Christ is, that to him is here ascribed a *common essence* with the Father, ver. 3 & 5. (For the particulars I must refer the reader to the work itself. Edit.) III. This Divinity is proved from the *eternity* of Christ, which cannot but *imply Deity*. That such eternity is ascribed to Christ is plain, 1st, from his creation of the world (2, 10.), which implies existence before the world; for before that, *time* was not, nor can any thing be thought of but eternity, and an eternal God. 2dly, from his own immutability (ver. 12). [For the proofs I must refer to the work itself. Edit.] IV. His Divinity is apparent from the *creation itself*. V. From creation, too, followed by the *preservation* of all things, which is ascribed to Christ, ver. 3. *φέρων*, &c. Now the *word of God* is the *fiat* of God. And this notion of that act of the Divine will by which He was pleased that the world should exist. VI. The argument is deduced from his *dominion* over all things, ver. 2. *ὃν ἔθηκε κληρόνομον*. [See Ernesti. Ed.] VII. From the *adoration* which is due to him from angels and men, ver. 6. For this universal adoration is an *ἀπαυγάσμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which can only be suitable to the *one true God*."

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. *ᾄθεν*—*Ἰησοῦν*. This is a repetition, with alteration, of what occurs at c. 2, 1—4. The Apostle now shows that Christ is greater than Moses, and

therefore more implicitly to be obeyed. (Ernesti and Rosenm.)

“Ὅθεν, “ this being the case ;” “ these things being so,” *proinde*. See Abresch. Ἀδελφοὶ ἄγιοι. The sense of this is copiously treated on by Abresch, Pierce, Carpzov, and Dindorf. The simplest method is to consider it, with Ernesti, as equivalent to *Christian friends or brethren*.

1. κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι.

Rosenm. thinks that this *calling*, or *offer*, is made by instruction in the Christian religion, and therefore he is partaker of the heavenly calling who has learnt the Christian religion. It is explained by others, “ an invitation from heaven to the Christian religion, and the felicity conjoined with it.” Thus ἐπουρ. will be for οὐρανόθεν, like the ἡ ἄνω κλήσεως at Phil. 3, 14. The *former* is the more regular interpretation: but this participation of the benefits of the Gospel is not obtained solely, or chiefly, by *learning the Christian religion*, but, in a general way, by the profession of faith in Christ at baptism, thereby accepting the offers made us in the Gospel, and subsequently fulfilling the solemn engagements then made. Thus only shall we become partakers of the benefits of the Gospel here, or can expect to participate in them hereafter.

Κατανοήσατε, “ survey, consider the nature and dignity of.” Ernesti refers to Rom. 4, 19. Τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. Ernesti observes that ἀπόστολος properly signifies *one sent*, a legate, or *interpres voluntatis*. So the Latin legatus, Orator, and the Greek ῥήτωρ. It must here mean, as being taken with ὁμολογ, the *negociator of the covenant*: for such is the sense of ὁμολογ., a term occurring not unfrequently in the Classical writers. Of the examples here adduced by the Philologists the most important are Diod. Sic. p. 257. μεσίτης ὁμολογίας and Philo 598., where the Pontifex V. T. is called μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας, which proves, not that Philo had read this Epistle (as some suppose), but that the expression was in use among the Theologians of his age. It is also explained by Chrys. τῆς πίστεως; which comes to the same thing. Thus is hinted the superiority of Christ to Moses and Aaron in quality of Divine legation and priesthood. On the sense of ἀρχ. here, Ernesti well remarks: “ Dicitur ita, quia Pontifex Judæorum per victimas in solemnī die expiationis sanxit fœdus, quod Deus cum hominibus et fecit et facturus erat per Jesum Christum. Is igitur typicè sic dicitur, Christus autem propriè, qui fœdus salutare, quod Deus nobiscum fecit, sanguine et morte sanxit, confirmavit, ratum fecit. Itaque hic est argumentum pro satisfactione Christi.” And Rosenm. annotates thus: “ Sic h. l. ἀρχιερεὺς in universum est salutis minister et princeps; comparatur enim cum Mose, qui partes ministri divini et servatoris populi sustinuit hactenus quatenus cum primo a servitute in libertatem vindicavit, rempublicam ejus et cultum legibus constituit, ac denique cum tanquam

rex in deserto aluit, et ad felicitatem promissam duxit." His matter is chiefly founded on Tittm. Diss. on the sense of ἀρχιερεὺς in the Epistle to the Hebrews, found in his Op. Theol. 211 seqq. See the able illustration of Schleus. in his Lex. in v., or as extracted by Mr. Slade.

2. πιστὸν ὄντα—οἶκω αὐτοῦ. A comparison is now *directly* made with Moses, who, at Num. 12, 7., is said to have been πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ Θεοῦ. Τῷ ποιήσαντι, "to Him who constituted him High Priest and redeemer of the human race. So Chrys. supplies ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα. See Morus and Dindorf. Abresch and Morus, however, think there is only a reference to the *Apostolate*, not the *High Priesthood*: though one seems intimately connected with the other. The sense of ποιεῖν here (like that of the Heb. פָּשַׁע) is frequent. See Carpzov. and Dindorf. By the οἶκῳ, Ernesti observes, is meant *family*, λᾶς (as Chrys. explains), the Jewish nation considered as God's family. So Acts 2, 36. οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ. Now of this Moses was only the *Æconomus*, or minister; but Christ, the heir and Lord. Rosenm. observes that the fidelity of Moses consisted in his leading and governing the people, and accomplishing the Divine commands: *Christ's* fidelity was shown by his discharge of the two-fold office committed to him of teaching, (Joh. 12, 42.) and of dying [or rather, atoning for the sins of the world by his death. Ed.]

3. πλείονος γὰρ—ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτὸν. The γὰρ introduces the *reason why* we are to attend to Jesus, namely, because he is greater than Moses. The παρὰ signifies *compared with* [and no other is the force of our *than* and the Hebr. מִן. Edit.] Πλείονος ἢ or πολλῆς παρὰ might have sufficed: but these double comparisons are Hebraic [and intensive]. (Rosenm.) Ἡξίωται. The term ἀξιούσθαι τινος is perpetually used by the best Classical writers; and, like the Latin *mereri*, often signifies more than *obtain, receive*. (See the numerous Classical examples of the philological Commentators.) And so Ernesti

and others. But here the context requires that it should be taken in its *primitive* sense, and *full extent* of signification.

With respect to the whole passage itself, there are few which, with the appearance of familiarity of expression, have more exercised the Commentators than this. It is impossible for me to notice, much less review, all the various opinions, for which I refer the reader to Pole, Wolf, and especially Dindorf ap. Ernesti. I must content myself with stating one or two which have the greatest semblance of truth. The best Interpreters seem agreed that the common rendering, "He who hath built the house hath more honour than the house," cannot represent the sense; since, however agreeable to the *figure*, it is quite inconsistent with the *context*. It is, too, almost universally admitted, that by *oikos* we are again to understand *family*. But on the exact sense then to be ascribed to the passage, Commentators are not agreed. The best founded opinion seems to be that of Ernesti, Dindorf, and most Commentators, for the last half century, that *κατασκευάζειν* here signifies *condere, constituere*. Dindorf, who has copiously discussed the sense, lays down the following very probable interpretation: "Qui familiam instituit, domum fundat, majorem dignitatem habet, quam ipse cœtus," i. e. familia et ii qui ad eam pertinent. He adds that by the founder of the family we are not to understand *God*; nor, by the house, the *Jewish Church*; but to suppose the meaning to be: Quo major sit conditor familiæ quam ipsa illa familia; eo majorem esse Christum Mose, s. quo magis præstet auctor familiæ eumque anteeat, eo magis etiam Christum Mose excellentiorem esse. We are (he also observes) to attend to the relation in which Moses stood to the family of God, who was no other than *Æconomus*, and first minister; and to remember that the son of a master of a family may equally be accounted the master as the *pater-familias* himself." The interpretation of Rosenm. differs but slightly from the above. He observes that *κατασκευάζειν* often signifies *præparare, instituere, adornare*; as Matt. 6, 10. And he who supplies a family with necessaries is called the *paterfamilias*. "Paterfamilias autem (adds he) vocatur Christus, quia ductor est novi populi, qui ab eo nomen gerit, *familia christianæ*, moderante tamen Deo, qui summus est paterfamilias, v. 4."

4. *πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπὸ τινός.* The sense to be assigned to this verse will depend upon the interpretation adopted in the preceding one. According to that which I have adopted, it will be as follows: "Every family has its head, or master, who provides for its welfare. But *God* is the *supreme Paterfamilias*, to whom his people, whether under the Old or the New Covenant, owe their origin, and who sent both Christ and Moses." Τὰ πάντα, for

ταῦτα πάντα; as Rom. 11, 29. It must, however, be confessed that the interpretation seems somewhat harsh and strained. But so great is the awkwardness connected with this verse, that we have only a choice of difficulties; and after all that has been written upon it (and that has been very considerable, as may be seen in the statements introduced by Dindorf), it will probably ever remain, though unimportant, one of the δυσνόητα which St. Peter speaks of in our Apostle.

5. καὶ Μωϋσῆς—θεράπων. Θεράπων is here not the same as δούλος; for *that* is opposed to ἐλευθερός, but *θεραπ.*, to the *children*, as here to the Son. See Ammon. in voc. It may therefore be rendered *minister, famulus*. Εἰς μαρτυρίαν τῶν λαληθησομένων, “that he might relate to the people what was to be promulgated in the name of God.” Μαρτυρεῖν signifies not only *testari*, but *mandata referre*; as μαρτύριον signifies *doctrine*. See 1 Cor. 1, 6. and 2, 1. Moses did not even remove the camp without the order of God. (Rosenm.) Moses had acted the part of a faithful *servant* (see Numb. 12, 7.) in promulgating the dispensation which was to be introductory to that more perfect one in after times, brought forward by Christ and the Apostles.

6. Χριστὸς δὲ, ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. On the meaning of αὐτοῦ the Commentators are little agreed. Many English ones refer it to *God*, supposing that by it was meant, that Moses and Christ were each faithful in God’s house: which is very true; but scarcely suitable to the context. I prefer, with some antients, and the most eminent moderns, to refer the pronouns respectively to *Moses* and to *Christ*. Thus there would seem to be a double antithesis. (And so Rosenm.) Moses was faithful, as a *servant in his house*, but Christ as a *son over his house*, i. e. his *own* house, or family. It is plain that the two families represent the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensation. So Theophyl.: Οἶκος ἦν τοῦ Μωϋσέως ὁ λαὸς, οὗ μέγας καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν. Οἶκον ἔχει καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἡμᾶς. I am aware, however, that much may

be said for the reading αὐτῷ, which is espoused by Schliting, Pierce, Abresch, and Dindorf, whom see. The *sense*, however, is much the same.

6. οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, “whose family we Christians are.” Rosenm. renders *erimus*. But this is an ill founded refinement. Ἐάνπερ—κατάσχωμεν. The *trajectio* is manifest. Καύχημα is here (as often) used in a *good* sense, to denote *joy*. Abresch, Dind., and Rosenm. take καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος to mean “*spes læta*,” the hope of eternal life on the conditions under which it has been promised by Christ. It is well remarked by Theophyl: Ἐνταυθα γὰρ προτρέπει αὐτοὺς καρτερεῖν ἐν τοῖς θλίψεσι, καὶ μὴ ἐκλύεσθαι· οὕτω γὰρ ἐσόμεθα οἶκος Θεοῦ, ὥσπερ ἦν Μωσῆς. Ἐγκομιάζει δὲ αὐτοὺς, δεικνὺς ὅτι ἤρξαντο μὲν, δεῖ δὲ καὶ τέλος προσθεῖναι.

7. “Jam in explicandâ illâ spe itâ pergit, ut cohortationem adjungat usque ad finem Capitis iv. cujus fundamentum ponit locum aliquem e Psalmo xcv. quare omnem adhortationem verbis inde depromptis proponit.” (Dindorf.)

7. διὸ, καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Some Commentators, as Ernesti, conjoin this with what follows after the long Scripture citation, namely, βλέπετε, ver. 12. Rosenm., however, thinks it may be understood elliptically; q. d. “Suppose that to you also has been said what the inspired Prophet utters, Ps. 95, 7—11.” Or so that the διὸ at ver. 7. may connect with ver. 8. μὴ σκληρύνθητε, “proinde ne sitis contumaces.” Be that as it may, the Apostle proceeds to exhort them to constancy in maintaining their faith to the last, and shows that a far greater obedience is to be rendered by Christians to the new religion than to the old one promulgated by Moses. This exhortation from ver. 7. to c. 4, 11., is founded on Ps. 95., which, in conformity to the Sept., the Apostle ascribes to David; though the opinions of recent Commentators are very various. See Dindorf, for into these doubtful discussions I shall not enter; only remarking that it may very

well bear that *double* sense. I must, however, notice the remark of Ernesti, that the expression λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα supplies an unanswerable argument for the inspiration of the Psalms. See also Whitby and Mackn. By the *voice*, in the mystical and most important sense, is plainly meant *God's calling* in the Gospel and the revelation of his will in the New Testament, and the salvation promised by Christ. See *supra*, ver 1. The emphasis and meaning of σημ. is too obvious to need dilating on.

8. μὴ σκληρύνητε—ἐρήμω. The student who is able should here, as in all such passages, compare the Hebr. text and the Sept., with the aid of such Commentators as he may chance to possess (especially the Crit. Sacr. and Pole's Synopsis, the latter a work indispensable to those who have not the advantage of a large library), by which minute discrepancies will not need to be reported in a work of this nature.

Rosenm. observes on the expression לֹא תִקְשָׁךְ, μὴ σκληρύνητε *kás kardías*, that the same verb occurs in Ex. 7, 3. 13, 15. and Deut. 2, 30., and is ascribed like נָכַח, &c., both to God and men; though in a different sense. Ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, the place called Marrabath, Exod. 17, 7. The word παραπικρασμὸς (says Rosenm.) signifies literally *a violent bitterness*, (the παρὰ being intensive), and, figuratively, *rebellion*. Πειρασμοῦ, for *Massah*, a name of a certain place in the desert, also given, from some story connected with it. In which cases it is not unusual for the Sept. to render the appellatives rather by the proper signification of the words. And so does Philo; thus ex. gr. he terms Jacob, ἀσκητὴν, &c. And so also the Talmudists. The *day* of Massah is the *time* when the people were encamped about Massah."

9. οὐ ἐπείρασάν—τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. Our translators render the οὐ *when*. But the best critics, as Gort., Hamm., Whitby, Ernesti, Dindorf, and Rosenm. interpret it *where*, i. e. the places before mentioned, Marabah and Massah. And this is confirmed

by Œcumen. And so some MSS. (by Gloss.) On the terms ἐπείρασαν and ἐδοκίμασαν some Commentators refine; and there would seem to be a climax: but (as Dindorf observes) they are found in an inverse order at Ps. 26, 2.; and therefore they appear to be synonymous, though united, to strengthen the sense. *Either* (Carpzov and Dind. remark) may signify to doubt of the assistance of God, (i.e. whether he can or will render it,) and to presumptuously dictate to him *when* to render it; or (as others explain) “demanding proofs of God’s government, providence, and power; seeing how far he would bear with them, whether he would punish them, or not.” It would be easy (but precarious) to enlarge the definition. See the note on 1 Cor. 10, 9.

The καὶ is rendered by Grotius, Dind., and Rosenmuller, *although* (like the Heb. כִּי); as in Joh. 18, 25., and sometimes in the classical writers, literally “*and (yet).*” Τὰ ἔργα μου, “the (wonderful) works I wrought for their protection, preservation, and sustenance in Egypt and the desert, convincing proofs of my power and faithfulness.” The τεσσαρ. ἔτη is, in the Sept., united with the following verse; διδ being omitted. And so some MSS. And this is required by chronology. Abresch is of opinion that the words were, in the Hebrew, left intentionally *in medio*, so as to be referred either to the preceding, or the following. At all events, Matth. thinks the Apostle did *in sense* connect the τεσσ. ἔτη with the following clause, as is plain from ver. 17.

10. διδὲ προσώχθισα—ἰδοὺς μου. The Commentators are not quite agreed on the sense of προσώχθισα, which some, as Castallio and Rosenm., render *per-tæsus, weary of*. By most it is interpreted *indignatus*. Its sense and metaphorical use (as Schleus. remarks) is the same as that of προσκίπτω and προσκρούω, *impingere*, to stumble at, be offended and indignant at, to loathe, feel aversion at, &c. Schleus. thinks it an Hellenistical use for ὀχθίζω or ὀχθέω (Hom. Il. A. 570.). It often occurs in the Sept.

See Trom. Lex. Rosenm. cites Sirach 1, 25. ἐν δυσὶν ἔθνεσιν προσώχθισεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

10. αἰὲς πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ. On the sense of these words Commentators differ; some thinking the καρδία to mean the *understanding*; others the *affections*; the former taking it of *speculative* and *mental error*. So Camer., Abresch, and Rosenm.; q. d. “they always entertain false opinions of me and of my power and veracity.” Others, as Owen, Dind., and Schleus., take it of *practical error*, namely, *vice*; and by καρδ. they understand the *affections*. Perhaps both may be included. The ὁδοὺς some explain *methods of action*. See Is. 55, 8. Others, as Est., Tirin., and Rosenm., take it to be synonymous with the ἔργα of the preceding verse. But the former interpretation seems preferable; for, as Owen says, His *ways comprehend his works*. Dind. interprets, rationes agendi, ipsa illa de quibus dictum erat ἔργα ut providentiæ Divinæ documenta. See Deut. 82, 4 & 32. and the authors referred to by Dind.

10. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, “have not cared to know.” So Grot. and Owen. It was not a simple ignorance, but dislike of what they knew.

11. ὡς ὄμοσα—κατάπαυσίν μου. The ὡς is rendered by Grot., Dind., and Rosenm. *itaque*, like the Hebr. וַשֵּׁן. By others, *so that*. Ὁργῇ. This, like all other human passions, is ascribed to God ἀνθρωποπάθως. El. This, the Commentators are agreed, is, like the Hebr. וַשֵּׁן, used in such kinds of oaths for οὐκ. But the ratio of the idiom is best understood by considering it as an elliptical phrase used per aposiopesin. The words to be supplied are obvious. See Whitby. The idiom is not unexampled in the popular use of our own language. I can scarcely, however, admit that it is *properly* called an *oath*.

By the κατάπαυσιν μου, is plainly meant the place of rest, Canaan, and the *rest itself* there to be enjoyed. The μου refers to God as the promiser and conferrer of that blessing.

The *application* of this to Christians is obvious. See the Commentators.

12. βλέπετε—ζώντος. The genitive ἀπιστίας is for the adjective, i. e. “an evil and unbelieving heart.”—“For (observes Rosenm.) he evinces an evil heart who has no faith in the promises, or the threatenings of God.” See Rom. 10, 10. Ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζώντος, “by departing from the living God.” Rosenm. takes it for εἰς τὸ, &c. By *God* is meant His *religion*, the Christian faith, since he who apostatizes from Christ, apostatizes from *God*. Θεοῦ ζώντος. A not uncommon epithet of the *Deity*, denoting the *true* God, as opposed to *dumb idols*, and false Gods. But Grot. thinks it is here used *efficaciter*, with reference to God’s ever living to inflict punishment on unbelievers.

13. ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε—ἁμαρτίας. Here ἐαυτοῦς is for ἀλλήλους: an idiom frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, of which Dind. adduces examples. Carpz. shows that under παρακ. is comprehended *teaching, admonition, entreaty, consolation, reprehension*, &c., each to be used as the case may suit. Ἀχρὶς οὐ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται. The ἄχρὶς οὐ is for ἐφ’ ὅσον; and καλεῖται is for λέγεται. The force of the whole phrase is explained by the ancients, and almost all moderns, “as long as life continues; as long as it can be said, to-day do so and so.” Dind. takes the λέγεται for κηρύσσεται; q. d. “as long as that *to-day* of the Psalm is read in your synagogues, and you are able to use its exhortation for your amendment, and final acceptance.”

13. ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Here there seems to be an ellipsis, which may be thus supplied. “(Use these and all such means) that none may, by neglect of them, be hardened and grow callous to all reasoning.” Σκληρύνεσθαι properly signifies to be so hard as not to yield to the pressure of the finger, and is here used (as most Commentators think) of the obstinacy of unbelief. So Theophyl.: ὥσπερ τὰ πεπωρώμενα σώματα καὶ

σκληρὰ οὐκ εἵκει τοῖς τῶν ἰατρῶν χερσίν· οὕτω καὶ αἱ σκληρυνθεῖσαι ψυχαὶ οὐκ εἴκουσι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The ἀμαρτίας is by Carpz. and Rosenm. taken for ἀμαρτωλοῖς. But this is too harsh. The most eminent moderns (rightly I think) take it of the error of unbelief, and temptation to apostasy (and so Theophyl. Τὸ μὴ ἐλπίζειν ὅτι ἐστὶ ἀνταπόδοσις), which ecclesiastical history informs us had prevailed over many. And Deind. says the term is often so used in this Epistle. The word *may*, however, be taken in its usual sense, and be not inapplicable; for sin blinds the understanding, and, by giving undue weight to carnal reasonings, plunges men into unbelief, and makes them sink into the torpor of unresisting vice. Thus some antients explain it ἀναληγσία.

14. μέτοχοι—κατάσχωμεν. These words are parenthetical. The best Commentators regard the γεγ. μετ. τ. X., as a periphrasis for *to be true Christians*; X_c. being put for the *religion* of Christ. The sense is: “we are partakers of the benefits of Christ’s religion (here and hereafter) *only* on condition that we hold,” &c. Ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως. A Hebrew hypallage for ὑποστ. τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, “our original confidence.” See Apoc. 2, 5. Ὑπόστασις (from ὑφίστασθαι. to *bear up, persist*, and also to be *firmly persuaded*) signifies here and in 2 Cor. 9, 4. a *firm confidence*. And so 11, 1. and often in the New Testament. (See Schleus. Lex.) Here, then, it denotes constancy in the profession of the Gospel, or (as Grot. explains) *fidem cum sanctâ professione conjunctam*.

15. ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι—παραπικρασμῷ. The Commentators are not agreed on the connection and force of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. Most moderns take it to mean, “*while* (I say) it is said, or sounded in your ears, hear,” &c. And they regard it as a resumption of what was said at ver. 13. the intermediate verse being parenthetical. And this mode of interpretation is supported by the authority of Chrys. and adopted by Grot. and Camer. It, however,

seems more simple, with others, as Abresch, Ernesti, and Dindorf, to regard the ἐν τῷ λέγ. as put for κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον, “forasmuch as it is said;” as 8, 13. ἐν τῷ λέγειν. And this is partly supported by Theophyl., whose words are these : Κατασκευάζει πῶς εἶπε τὸ, μέχρι τέλους· καὶ φησιν, ὅτι τοῦτο δηλούται ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, σήμερον· τὸ γὰρ σήμερον, αἱ ἐστίν.

16. τινὲς γάρ—Μωϋσέως. On the sense of these words various have been the opinions of critics. Chrys. and the antients (including the Syr.) and many moderns (as Rosenm.), would take them interrogatively, regarding the γάρ not as *causal*, but *interrogative*. They trace the connection thus : “When it is said, to-day, &c. (I ask), who were those who, hearing the word of God, rebelled?” (See Pole.) “The Apostle (says Rosenm.) lays before the Hebrews the example of the Israelites of old, in order to show them that it is not enough to *hear* and bear in mind the Divine commands, that we are also to *obey* them, and repose faith in the Divine promises.” Some exceptions (which my limits will not permit me to state) have indeed been taken to this mode of interpretation, but perhaps not of sufficient weight to overturn it. See the copious discussions of Dind. After all, however, there may be much doubt as to the true interpretation.

17. τίσι δὲ—ἐρήμω. On προσωχ. see the note supra, ver. 10. Ἀμαρτήσασιν must here be understood like the ἀμαρτίας at ver. 13., and denote *unbelief* and *apostacy*. “For (as Ernesti observes) unbelief is the fountain of all sins, as faith is that of all virtues.” Thus in the present passage vice and sin may be *included*. Πίπτειν (Dindorf observes), like the Hebr. לָפַט, is often used of a violent death, and especially of Divine wrath. Thus at 1 Cor. 10, 10. it is interchanged with κατεστρώθησαν. See Joel ver. 5. Κῶλα is by many antients and moderns thought to be put, by synecdoche, for the whole of the bodies. But to this principle it is unnecessary to resort; since (as Dind. observes) the κῶλα properly denoted

the *limbs* (arms and legs) as distinguished from the *trunk*. And this mode of interpretation (which is supported by the Syr.) yields quite as proper, and indeed a preferable sense; for there is (as Dindorf observes) an elegant ὑποτόπωσις. It is singular the Commentators should not have compared Ps. 141, 8. “our bones lie scattered, as when one breaketh and heweth wood upon the earth.” And this is illustrated by the accounts travellers give us of the state of the Asiatic and African deserts, especially Denham and Clapperton in their recent travels into Zahara. Now the κῶλα is a very suitable term; since (as we learn from the Medical writers) it denotes the larger bones, as the leg and arm bones, and the spinal bone (see Foes. Œc. Hipp.); now *these* (which are all that are *left*), in the dry climate of the East, continue for a long time uncorrupted.

18, 19. τίσι—ἀπιστίαν. Compare supra, ver. 11. The ὥμοσε may denote *solemn asseveration* rather than *swearing* properly so called. See the note supra, ver. 11. The true force of ἀπειθ. is clear from what has been said of ἀπιστία. Καί, “and (so).” See Abr. and Heinr. Not *therefore*, as Mich. and others render. The ἠδυνήσαν is ill interpreted by Abresch and others *would* not. And on βλέπομεν too many refinements have been sought. It is sufficient to take this and the ἠδυν. *populariter* (so Grot., Carpz., and Ernesti), i. e. “we see by the story and the event;” q. d. “we are authorized to infer from the story and the event, that the reason why they could not enter, was their unbelief.”

CHAP. IV.

VER. 1. The Apostle now treats the history *allegorically*; applying what he has said to *Christians*; q. d. “For *we* have a Divine promise like that the Israelites received, though far greater and more precious.” (Dindorf and Rosenm.) So Theophyl. :

Ἐνταῦθα ἡ ἀπόδοσις τοῦ, Ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς· Φοβηθῶμεν, &c. Τὸ δὲ, οὖν, ἐτέθη διὰ τὸ διὰ μικροῦ ἀποδεδοῖσθαι τὸν λόγον, ἐπαναλήψεως γενομένης.

The καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας are regarded by Rosenm. as genitives of *consequence*. It is of more importance to consider the *sense*, which is explained by some (as Strigil, Flac., Hyperius, Est., Limb., and Carpz.) *spretâ promissione*: by others (as Wolf, Pisc., Bengel, Mich., Abresch, &c.) *relicta et adhuc residua*; which is more agreeable to the context, and is confirmed by Wetstein's examples. Ὑστερεῖν properly signifies to *come too late*, and consequently to *miss of* any thing, and *lose* it. The δοκῇ has little meaning, but great elegance. On this kind of pleonasm see Dind. Theoph. says the Apostle uses it ἰλαρώτερον καὶ ἀνεπαχθέστερον τὸν λόγον ποιῶν.

1. φοβήθωμεν denotes not so much *fear* as the consequent on it, *anxiety*, solicitude, and great circumspection. So Theodoret explains it: σπουδάσωμεν. It is singular that the Commentators, who treat with needless minuteness on the sense, should not have cited a kindred passage at Phil. 2, 13. "work out your own salvation with *fear* and trembling."

The nature of this *promise* and the *rest* prepared is explained in the following verses.

2. καὶ γὰρ εὐαγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ καὶ κείνοι, i. e. literally, "for we are evangelized (or, "have an εὐαγγέλιον or offer made to us) as well as they; as to them was held out Palestine, the promised land; so to us is held out the spiritual Palestine, another country, even a heavenly. This use of the passive is Hellenistical.* And that of εὐαγγελίζειν, though

* On which Grot. annotates thus; "Constructio Græca, qualis Mat. 11, 5. Luc. 7, 22. quæ Passivum personæ facit etiam ex Activo Dativum regente; idque hic eo facilius procedit, quod Activum εὐαγγελίζω non tantum cum Dativo, ut Luc. 1, 19. and 2, 10. sed et cum accusativo, construitur, ut Luc. 3, 18." See also Abresch, who cites some examples from the Fathers, especially of εὐαγγ. with an accusative.

not at variance with the sense of the term, which may signify a *promise* of good as well as an *announcement* of good, is peculiar to the Apostle.* On the *nature* of the promises made to the Israelites the earlier and the later modern Commentators are at issue. See Pole's Syn. and Dind.; for into so extensive a subject I cannot enter.

The λόγος ἀκοῆς is a Hebraism for λόγος ἀκούμενος: for (as Rosenm. observes) רַבֿרַבֿ may mean *promise*, i. e. of the promised land; an εὐαγγέλιον to wanderers on the trackless sandy desert.

2. μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. There is some variation in the reading of this passage, and difference of opinion thereupon. (See Dindorf.) Both seem to have arisen from the difficulty found in tracing the metaphor. The best Critics seem agreed that the common reading is to be retained; and that it contains an allusion to the digestion of food, its concoction, and conversion to chyle and nourishment.

Τοῖς ἀκούσασιν is for ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων.

3. εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατὰπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες.

The present is said to be here put for the future, or *pro omni tempore*. The sense may be expressed thus: "we who believe are to enter into (the enjoyment of) that rest." The οἱ πιστευσ. is emphatical; q. d. *we alone*. Τὴν κατὰπαυσιν, "the rest (promised by God)," i. e. the *felicity*; for *rest* is a very fit image of happiness; and especially considering its primary application to the possession of the promised land; since to fatigued way-farers "a *blink of rest* would be a *sweet enjoyment*," to use the words of the Scottish Theocritus.

But there are many difficulties, and consequently a variety of jarring opinions concerning the sense of the whole passage from ver. 3—10., which the limited nature of my work will not allow me to detail. I must refer the reader to Pole, Wolf, and Dindorf.

* Abresch, Carpzov, and Dind., however, think εὐαγγ. has here simply the sense of κηρύσσειν, "we were preached to." But Ernesti, Morus, Rosenm., and Jaspis rightly insist on the notion of *promise*, which is maintained by all the earlier moderns, and is supported by the antients. So Theophyl.: "Ὅρα δὲ πῶς ἐφ' ἡμῶν μὲν εὐαγγελισμὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐκάλεσεν, ὥς ἀληθινῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπόσχεσιν. See also Chrys. and Theodoret.

The structure and air of the passage is in the highest degree involved, and perfectly in the Jewish style. The difficulty turns very much on the interpretation of the *κατάπαυσιν Θεοῦ*, which the best modern Commentators interpret, "a happiness similar to that which God enjoys." See Grot., Whitby, and Dindorf. They adduce many similar expressions from Philo. After *κατάπαυσιν μου* Rosenm. and Dindorf supply *δι' ἀπιστίαν*, which completes the sense, but may be dispensed with; nor does it form any regular ellipsis. The words *καίτοι*—*γεννηθέντων* they connect with the former part of the verse; and rendering *καίτοι et quidem*, thus translate the clause: "Requiem intelligo ab omnibus operibus a mundo condito (inter homines) peractis," i. e. that complete felicity which men shall enjoy after the accomplishment of the business of this life. This (I confess) appears a somewhat harsh interpretation: but the whole is so perplexed that we have only a choice of difficulties; and perhaps the method in question involves the fewest. Dind. and Rosenm. cite a passage from Primasius on this Epistle, p. 507., which is as follows: "Intelligitur regnum cœleste s. felicitatem æternam, ad quam quos pervenire contigerit planissimè requieturi sint a laboribus et ærumnis hujus sæculi, non tantum a molestiis longi itineris, ut olim Israelitæ; unde illa felicitas, quæ credentibus promissa sit, non est similis ei, quæ Israelitæ fruii essent, sed ei quæ Deus ipse fruatur, maximâ et perfectissimâ." Towards the illustration of the sense of the whole passage the following observation of Theophyl. seems to me very important: Βούλεται δείξαι τρεῖς καταπαύσεις κεκλημένas ἐν τῇ θεῖᾳ γραφῇ καὶ πρώτην μὲν τὴν ἐβδόμην ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ τὴν κτίσιν πεπλήρωκεν ὁ Θεός· δευτέραν δὲ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὴν γῆν· τρίτην δὲ γε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· κατασκευάζει δὲ τὴν ταύτης ἀποδείξειν ἀπὸ τῆς προφητικῆς μαρτυρίας· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀληθῶς, φησιν, ἐστὶν ἑτέρα κατάπαυσις, τί δήποτε τοῖς τὴν δευτέραν δεξαμένοις καὶ παρεγγυᾷ μὴ σκληρύναι τὰς καρδίας, καὶ ἀπειλεῖ τιμωρίαν, καὶ τῶν τῆς δευτέρας καταπαύσεως καταπεφρονηκότων ποιεῖται τὴν μνήμην; κατὰ τάξιν δὲ ταῦτα τίθησι, καὶ πρώτην μὲν τὴν τῆς ἐβδόμης ἡμέρας. Nor can I omit the following of Theophyl.: Δοκεῖ ἀνακόλουθος εἶναι ὁ λόγος, οὐκ ἔστι δέ· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο φησιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει τις εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Δαβὶδ περὶ τῆς καταπαύσεως λέγει τῆς τοῦ σαββάτου· πῶς γὰρ, ἥτις πάλοι γεγένητο, καὶ ὅτε κατ' ἀρχὴς ὁ κόσμος τὴν σύστασιν ἔλαβεν; ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὅτι περὶ ἀλλῆς τινὸς λέγει ὁ Δαβὶδ καταπαύσεως, τῆς εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς· εἰσελεύσεως· ἥτις καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐγκέκλιται, ὡς ὀφειλόντων δηλαδὴ τινῶν μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσελθεῖν· Καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ σάββατον κατὰπαυσις λέγεται παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐκόλυσε κατάπανσιν μετὰ ταῦτα λεχθῆναι καὶ τὴν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας εἰσοδοῦ· οὕτως οὐδὲ νῦν κωλύει μετὰ ταύτην πάλιν κατάπαυσιν κληθῆναι τὴν μέλλουσαν, τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν φημι βασιλείαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ ἀπιστήσαντες οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται. The reader may also, with advantage, consult a useful sketch of the argumentation from ver. 3. to 10., as laid down by Mr. Slade, who (I think) very well represents the Apostle's meaning: but how to adjust the expressions to that and such other schemata, "hic labor, hoc opus est." In truth, the difficulties cannot be

satisfactorily solved, without entering into such a length as to require a pamphlet rather than a note.

4. *εἶρηκε—αὐτοῦ*, i. e. “there is mention made in Scripture of *a rest of God*.” That a rest is also promised to *men*, he will at ver. 5. deduce from the other above mentioned place. (Rosenm.) *Που*, i. e. Gen. 2, 2. This vague mode of citation was common in that age, and sufficed for those who were so thoroughly conversant in Scripture. The best Commentators, as Carpz. and Rosenm., think that the Apostle means to represent this rest of God as an image of the height of future felicity; and they adduce several passages of Philo which strongly countenance this interpretation.

5. *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ—κατάπαυσίν μου*, “From this understand that to men also is promised this rest, namely, the *rest of God*.” For in that Psalm mention is made of men who shall *enter that rest*, or *not enter it*. The *nervus probationis* is in *ἐλεύσονται*; for this belongs to men. (Rosenm.)

6. *ἐπεὶ οὖν—αὐτῇν*, “Since therefore it follows from thence, that certain are to enter this place of rest,” i. e. that all have *access* to it; for those only are excluded who believe not. *Ἀπολείπεται*, “it is collected, it follows.” The *οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες* are those who had gone out from Egypt, and to whom this rest was promised, but under condition of faith and obedience. See *supra*, ver. 2 and 3. (Rosenm.) The difficulty here is much increased by the omission, in several instances, of the *conclusion*, which follows from the premises, and which is not deduced till ver. 9.

7. *πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, &c.* “And again he defines and appoints a certain time, a to-day,” i. e. he defines and mentions another time by the same name *to-day*, at which they were to enter into this rest; saying, “by David, after such a time as we have before mentioned, namely, forty years.” *Καθὼς εἰρηται*, “as was before mentioned,” namely, c. 5, 7 and

8. Now David lived long after the promise had been made to the Jews in the desert; and yet he makes mention of a certain rest yet to be expected. Therefore it cannot be objected, that after that rest promised to the Israelites no other is to be expected. It is rather to be collected, that besides that rest to which Joshua had brought the people, another is held out, of which all in the age of David might be partakers who should obey the Divine commandments. (Rosenm.)

8. εἰ γὰρ—ἡμέρας, “For if Joshua had brought them to *that* rest (i. e. true and stable one), God would not have spoken, by David, of another time hereafter, from which we are to beware lest we be excluded.” Κατέπαυσεν. For the pluperfect subjunctive, and to be taken in a hiphil sense, i. e. “caused to rest.” Now the rest to which Joshua brought them was not the true, stable, and perfect one. See Hebr. 13, 14. (Rosenm.) The *other time* is the age of the Gospel and the Giver of it, Christ. See Matt. 11, 28 and 29.

On the three preceding verses Theophyl. annotates thus: Τὸ ὄλον τοῦτο σπεύδει δείξαι, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς μὲν ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, οὐκ ἠδυνήθη εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς ταύτην τὴν κατάπαυσιν, περὶ ἧς καὶ τῷ Δαβίδ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἡμῖν νῦν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὐκ εἰσήγαγεν, ὁ δὲ Δαβὶδ λέγει πάλιν μὲν τοσαῦτα ἔτη, Μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς οἱ πατέρες οἱ διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν μὴ εἰσελθόντες, καὶ δίδωσιν ἡμῖν νοεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύωμεν, εἰσελευσόμεθα, δὴλον ὅτι ἡ κατάπαυσις αὕτη μέλλουσα ἐστὶ, καὶ περιμένει ἡμᾶς· περὶ γὰρ τῆς Παλαιστίνης οὐκ ἐπηγγέλλετο δῆπου ὁ Δαβὶδ· ταύτην γὰρ κατεῖχον τότε, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τῆς ἐβδόμης αὕτη γὰρ ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἦν. Ἄρα οὖν τρίτη τις ἐστὶν, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, εἰς ἣν ὁ ἀληθινὸς εἰσάγει Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν πίστις.

9. ἄρα ἀπολείπεται—Θεοῦ, “so then there remaineth a rest for the people of God.” By *rest* is meant perfect, real *happiness*. By *the people of God* are meant all true Christians, or those who should become so. The word σαββατισμὸς properly signifies, a keeping of the Sabbath by holy rest, and worship of God. But it is here used to denote that rest and felicity in heaven, that *eternal sabbath*,

which God's faithful servants will enjoy.* Examples from Philo are adduced by Carpz. and others of a use of *σάββατον* in the metaphorical sense of a *serene and quiet life*. Striking, indeed, in many respects, are the coincidences between the modes of thought and expression of that spiritual Jew, and of the Apostle.

10. It is here observed by Theophyl.: Ἑρμηνεύει πῶς σαββατισμὸν ἀνόμασε τὴν τοιαύτην κατάπαυσιν· διότι, &c.

10. ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν—ὁ Θεός, “For he who hath come unto the rest (of God), he also himself resteth from his works, as God from his,” i. e. he who attains to that felicity similar to the Divine, will enjoy the most pure and perfect pleasure. The whole passage is allegorical. For the history is applied to a thing, in many respects indeed different, though in some things aptly corresponding to that with which it is compared. The sense, allegorically expressed, will be as follows: “God resteth; to his people is promised rest; the Israelites have not attained to rest, by reason of their unbelief; but by believing they will enjoy this rest.” Expressed in the *natural* way, it will be this: “God enjoys supreme felicity; to men also will God impart this; the Israelites, by reason of their unbelief, have not been made partakers of this felicity; but by believing, they will it.” (Rosenm.)

11. σπουδάσωμεν—κατάπαυσιν. On the preceding allegorical application the Apostle engrafts an *exhortation* (which is also a *conclusion* from it) to strive after the attainment of that rest, namely, Heaven, (and not, as Pisc. explains, the attaining unto obedience to Christ). It is observed by Theophyl., that σπουδ. is used, in order to show that not faith of itself suffices to bring us thither, but it must be accompanied with a virtuous life. The Commentators have

* So Theophyl.: Οὐκ εἶπε, κατάπαυσις, ἀλλὰ σαββατισμὸς, τὸ οἰκεῖον ὄνομα θεῖς, καὶ ᾧ ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐπέτρεχον. Οὕτω δὲ καλεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

not observed that the εἰσελθεῖν εἰς is used with allusion to the sense crouched under these words, namely, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

11. ἵνα μὴ ἐν αὐτῷ—ἀπειθείας. The construction here is dubious. Some early moderns, and Abresch, take it for ἵνα μὴ τῇ αὐτῇ τις ἐμπέσει ὑποδεδειγμένη ἀπειθεία. Which is the most *obvious* construction, and in a Classical writer would be the true one; but the character of the Apostle's style, being so very different, alters the case. The best Critics, from Grot. to Dindorf and Rosenm., have seen that πάσῃ must be taken absolutely, with reference to 3, 17.; though here in a figurative sense. And the ἐν must be considered as put for διὰ, *by, after*. An Hypallage for τῇ ἀπειθείᾳ τῇ ἐν ὑποδείγματι, “Ne quis vestram incidit in inobedientiam talem qualis illi exemplar dedere. See Num. 14. And this is supported by the authority of the antient Commentators. Ὑπόδειγμα is for παράδειγμα, of which Abr. and Dind. adduce examples; as Eph. Syr. 3, 192., ὑποδ. καὶ τύπον, and 289., ὑποδ. ἀμαρτιῶν, and 247., ὑποδ. ἀπιστίας. I would compare Juv. Sat. 10, 167. Ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias! “*To point a moral, and adorn a tale.*”

12. ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής.

By the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the best Commentators are agreed is meant the language of God in Scripture, or in the Gospel, whether in its promises, or threatenings, which latter are had especially in mind. (Compare Ps. 95.) The ζῶν is explained by the ἐνεργῆν; and both signify *active, efficacious*, what exerts its power. Then the force of the Divine threats, when unheeded, are depicted by a most sublime and beautiful image derived from that which in things corporeal is thought the most cutting, namely, a μάχαιρα δίστομος (As Apoc. 1, 16.), ית פִּי רַב סֵיפִר; a sword being always a symbol of vengeance. Τομώτερος. This is explained by the Gloss. τμητικώτερος. And so Hesych. Examples are adduced by Wets. from Soph., Plato, &c., and among the rest Phocyl. 119., ὅπλον τοι λόγος ἀνδρὶ τιμώτερον ἐστὶ σιδήρου. The word τομαῖος also occurs in Æschyl and Eurip.

12. διῴκνούμενος—μυελῶν. Wets. compares Æschyl. Theb. 515., ἰκνεῖται λόγος διὰ στήθεων. And Dind., Justin Mart., λόγου δυαμένου εἰς ψυχὴν διῴκνουμένης. On the exact force of the metaphor in ἄχρι—πνεύ-

ματος, Commentators are not agreed. It seems not necessary to refine, but, with Abr., Dindorf, &c., regard the πνεῦμα and ψυχὴν (in this use) as a popular expression denoting the mind, thoughts, and feelings. And μερισμοῦ may be taken simply to signify the *inmost part*; since, in an equal division of any thing, the place of cutting, or dividing, *will* be at the *inmost* part. With respect to the ἀγμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, Grot. observes: "Per translationem ea quæ sunt corporis, applicat animo." And Chrys., Theophyl., Theodoret, Isid. Pel. Ep. 1, 94., and Hamm., rightly recognise an allusion to the Priests (in sanctification) cutting the victim *down the back-bone*, so as to search every bone and part, that all might be found pure before the sacrifice. At the same time, it is not improbable (though the Commentators do not notice it) that there may be an allusion to that most horrible exercise of the μάχαιρα δίστομος, by which (as we find from the Classical writers) a man was sometimes absolutely cut *in two* down the back-bone. The ἀρμῶν are very applicable to the *commissuræ* by which the ribs are fastened to the back-bone.

The next words, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, are, in some measure, exegetical, and show whither the preceding comparison tended. The sense is, that the word of God (or God by his word), is a discerner and trier of the thoughts and feelings of the heart (the ἐνθυμι καὶ ἐνν. being a *popular* expression). The application is obvious. See the Commentators. It is singular that they should not have seen that the Apostle had in mind Ps. 7, 9. (Theodot.) ἐταστῆς καρδιῶν καὶ νεφρῶν ὁ Θεός. The whole is well paraphrased by Jaspis thus: "Minæ Dei non in irritum cadent; non est vana et sine viribus ejus ira; minæ Dei neglectæ acerbissimè pungunt et gravissimè vulnerant animum, animi corporisque discidium inducere valent, non solum illis hominum facta puniuntur, sed etiam consilia in intimis pectoris humani latebris ac recessibus abdita."

13. καὶ οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.

By the αὐτοῦ is meant *God*, not the antecedent ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. The general sense of the words is sufficiently clear; but on the mode of eliciting that sense from them Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Camer. and Irhoven, recognise an agonistical metaphor. But this is very harsh. The most favourite opinion for the last century is that of Erasm., that as τραχηλίζειν signifies to twist back the neck, so there may be an allusion to the antient custom, explained by Periz. on Ælian V. H. 12, 58., by which criminals proceeding to execution had their heads drawn forcibly backward, in order to bring their countenances the more under the gaze of the multitude. But this seems very far-fetched, and it is not probable *such* a circumstance would have been alluded to by the Apostle. Upon the whole, I see no opinion so little liable to objection as that of Chrys. and the other antients, and, of the moderns, Grot. Beza, Atling, Hamm., Gatak., Braun., Beausob., Dodd., Harwood, &c., that the ἀφανὴς signifies καλύμμενα, πεφανερωμένα, with an allusion to the τραχήλισμος, or cutting down of the τράχηλος, or back-bone, just before adverted to in ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν. And, although it is objected, that there is no authority for this signification, yet that is no more than may be said of many other idioms of the Apostle, no doubt, often Cilicisms, or provincial phrases, and therefore not found in the Classical writers; though likely enough to be known by Chrys., who was born and lived not many miles from Cilicia, and whose authority, in such matters, ought to carry the greatest weight.

13. πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. Some take the λόγος as *sermo*; others (like the Hebr. דבר) to denote *negotium, res*. And so Ern. and Rosenm. But this seems very frigid. So that (especially on account of the πρὸς) I prefer the interpretation of Chrys., Theophyl., Œcumen., Syr., Wolf, Loesn., Abr., Dind., and others, *account*, ᾧ μέλλομεν δοῦναι τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς εὐθύνas τῶν πεπραγμένων. See Luke 16, 2., Rom. 14, 12., Hebr. 13, 17., 1 Pet., 4, 5., 1 Cor., 4. 5., 2 Cor. 9, 10.

14. ἔχοντες οὖν—Θεοῦ. The οὖν is resumptive; for after the digression on the Jews in the desert, the Apostle returns to the *High Priest* mentioned at 3, 1., and shows that Jesus Christ is far superior to the High Priests of the Old Testament (Rosenm.), q. d. “We, too, have a High Priest, and one greater, and who hath passed to the *heavens* (and not merely, as the High Priests of the Old Testament, to the Sanc-

tum Sanctorum), even Christ Jesus. Having, then, such an one, let us hold fast by our covenant," &c. These two sentences are blended into one.

14. διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, i. e. literally, "hath passed through the heavens (so as to attain the highest, the seat of Divine majesty)." There is (I think rightly) thought by Carpz. to be an allusion to the passing of the High Priest every year, εἰς μεσαίτατον τὸν νεὸν (of which we read in Philo), and, as he also says, through four porticos, which Joseph. and the Rabbins say represented the *heavens*. Thus all is clear. By this "passing to the highest heavens" it is manifestly declared, that the work of expiation is completed, and an access obtained to approach God in prayer, with a hope of acceptance. Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, "even the *Son of God* himself, not, like Aaron or Joshua, and the High Priests, a *minister of God*." Κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. I would not understand thus (with many Commentators), of the profession of faith in the Priesthood, but take ὁμολ. in the same manner as at 3, 1., of the Christian *covenant*, or rather our *covenanted faith* in the Christian religion.

15. οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν—ἀμαρτίας. This is meant to further show the superiority of the Christian High Priest to that of the Mosaic Dispensation. In this comparison I cannot, however, think (with Abr. and Jaspis) that there is an allusion to the unfeeling pride of the Jewish High Priests; that were too frigid. Grot., and the best Critics, take the δυναμ. as referred, *ad effectum*; as supra, 2, 18. The ασθ. they interpret *adversities*, especially calamities suffered for religion's sake; and the πεπειρ. they render, "exercised with these afflictions," &c. A mode of interpretation supported by the authority of the antient Greek Commentators. But thus the words χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας will have a very frigid sense, i. e. "without giving way under his afflictions." I must, therefore, prefer the most extensive sense the word will bear, and understand it of those various *frailties* and *weaknesses* of our nature which expose us to

numerous temptations, either to abandon religion, or not to fulfil its injunctions. Though, doubtless, the Apostle had in view *especially* the *temptations* to *abandon* the religion, from the afflictions which its profession then brought with it.

The true sense of this whole verse has been excellently laid down in an admirable Sermon of Dr. Blair, Vol. 2., p. 117.

16. προσερχώμεθα ὄν—βοήθειαν, “having such a High Priest, and Mediator, let us with good courage approach (with our prayers) to the throne of grace” (i. e. of a gracious God). Some think there is here an allusion to the Jewish notion of God having two thrones, one of mercy, another of judgment. But this seems frigid and far-fetched. Παρρησίας, *courage, confidence*; as often in the New Testament. Ἐσρωμεν, *obtain*. Ἐλεον is explained by the Philologists *auxilium*. If that be the sense, ἔλεον καὶ χάριν may be an hendiadis. It is to be observed, that all the gracious dispensations of God towards men are, in the language of Scripture, called his *mercies*, to hint to us our own unworthiness, and encourage a spirit of humility.

16. εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν seems to be put for εἰς βοήθειαν ἡμῶν ἐν καιρῷ, i. e. in the hour of affliction, trial, and temptation.

CHAP. V.

The Apostle proceeds now to show the superiority of the New to the Old Testament; and he begins by first comparing the Priesthood, thus setting forth the great superiority of Christ. As, however, it might be objected, that many things were found in the High Priests that were not in Christ (for he was neither of the Priestly state, nor a Priest in any way, nor chosen of men, nor had any of the outward appearance or pomp of a Priest, but every thing in him was *spiritual*); the Apostle therefore states what

Christ really had in *common* with the other High Priests, and then what were the points of *superiority*. For when it can be shown that any one has certain things in common with others, and in other things exceeds them, then does his superiority appear. (Theophyl.)

VER. 1. *πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιεὺς—ἀμαρτιῶν*. The Apostle proceeds to prove the superiority of Christ's Priesthood over that of Aaron, by showing that he hath all the qualities requisite in a High Priest, and that in the highest degree. *Πᾶς—ἀμαρτιῶν*, "Every High Priest taken, selected, and called from men is appointed (such) for (the welfare of) men, in respect to observances towards God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for (their) sins. *Λαμβ.* is, like the Hebr. *לָקַח* in Num. 25, 4., used in the sense *segregate*. At *τὰ* must be understood *κατὰ* and *πράγματα*. *Προσφέρειν* is a sacrificial term, signifying to *bring to the altar*; as Matt. 5, 23. Joh. 16, 2. Acts 7, 42. &c. where see the notes. The *δῶρα* and *θυσίας* are general terms, comprehending sacrifices of every kind. The former occurs in Matt. 5, 23. and Mark 1, 44., and is used of *Holocausts* in Levit. 4, 3. [Some think *δῶρα* signifies spontaneous offerings; and *θυσ.* the sacrifices directed by the law. But it would (perhaps) be difficult to establish this distinction. Ed.] Since, therefore, every High Priest is appointed, not for his own sake, but for that of other men, this holds good also of *Christ*. (Rosenm.)

2. *μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις*. On the sense of *μετριοπαθεῖν* the Commentators are at issue. The best founded opinion seems to be, that it here signifies "to carry oneself with moderation, lenity, and mercy, to hold in the passions with such an even hand as not to give way to excess in anger, or any of the violent feelings, and consequently, bear with the failings of other men." Examples of this signification are adduced by the Philological Commentators from Josephus and other writers.

Δυνάμενος is taken by Jaspis for ἵνα δύνηται, as expressing the cause why, &c. Compare 2, 18. Grot., Beza, and Owen think δυνάμενος refers *ad effectum*; as supra, 2, 18. and 4, 15.; q. d. “qui aptus, idoneus, et prosperus sit.”

2. ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις. Some explain this, those who sin through inadvertence, forgetfulness, or sudden impulse, and not deliberately: in which cases the High Priest was allowed to show clemency. Others take the ἀγν. of *vice* or *sin*, with an adjunct notion of ignorance. And this use is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. But the former interpretation (which is espoused by the antient Commentators) seems more agreeable to the context. Ἐπεὶ—ἀσθενείαν. The metaphor in περικεῖται is usually explained “obnoxious est infirmitati, undique premittur.” But, like most metaphors taken from *dress* (see Eph. 6, 13. and Col. 3, 12.) it seems to import what is *habitual*. By the ἀσθ. must be understood, not *misery* (as Pierce and others explain), but *frailty*, liability to sin. And Dindorf cites Eph. Syr. 3. ἐγὼ ἀσώματος εἰμι, καὶ οὐ περίκειμα ἀσθενείαν. Œcumen. explains it ἁμαρτίαν. But this cannot so well be admitted.

3. καὶ διὰ ταύτην—ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, “And for this frailty, and the sin arising from it, he is bound to offer up, as for the sins of the people, so also for his own sins.” On the particulars of both kinds of sacrifices, see Levit. 4, 9 and 16. Some carry the points of comparison in this parallel too far, and refine too much. Rosenm. observes, that it must not be extended ultra tertium comparationis. The similitude (he adds) is this: “A human Priest himself falls into sin; therefore he exercises lenity towards those who sin. Christ was afflicted; therefore he is ever ready to assist the afflicted.” Whence the Apostle adds, c. 4, 15. χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. To the latter part of this position I cannot assent. See the note supra, 4, 15. It is (I apprehend) meant, that as Christ experimentally knows all the infirmities and liabilities

to temptation of our nature, so he is enabled and fitted to act as our Judge.

4. καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ — Ἀαράν. A new argument, namely, that Christ may justly be accounted a High Priest, though not of the tribe of Levi. Τιμὴ denotes any *public office*, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and though applicable to the Priesthood in general, yet was especially so to the *High* Priesthood, which among the Jews (as a remnant of antient theocracy) carried with it dignity and splendour almost regal. Thus at the next verse the τιμὴ is called δόξα. (Rosenm.)

5, 6. οὕτω καὶ — γεγέννηκά σε. At ὁ λαλήσας repeat ἐδόξασε from the preceding clause. It is observed by Theophyl., that this is proved from the constant language of Scripture; as Joh. 8. ἀπεσταλὴν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα. Now Christ did not act as those who snatch at honours, like Korah and his conspirators. Christ's Pontifical office, too, was far superior to that under the law, inasmuch as he was appointed to it by the immediate investment of heaven, in virtue of his relation to God *as Son*; and therefore was High Priest in a far more elevated, nay even *august* sense; as is proved and illustrated from Ps. 2., and then from Ps. 110, 4, where ἱερεὺς is (as often) put for Ἀρχιερ.; in which case the term is used κατ' ἐξοχήν.

The κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, as answering to the Hebrew על דברתו, signifies καθάπερ, κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίότητα; as Macc. 9, 18. Now Christ is a High Priest like Melchisedec; therefore there was no need that he should be born of the tribe of Levi. This is further urged infra, 6, 20. and c. 7. The Apostle now explains in *what* Jesus Christ, *our* High Priest, profits us. (Rosenm.) Having himself experienced the weaknesses, trials, and tribulations of human nature, he can have a fellow feeling with his brethren who are exposed to the same trials.

7. The Apostle (as Theodoret observes) proceeds to show that our Lord, except *sin*, bore all the παθή-

ματα of human nature. Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, “at the time when he lived as a man among men.” Ἡμ. is often simply for *time*. The mention of σαρκὸς carries with it an adjunct notion of weakness and affliction. Ἰκετηρίας (on which see Ernesti) is a stronger term than δειήσεις, which is a general one to denote entreaty of every kind. It usually happens that the stronger term is introduced *last*; of which the Commentators adduce examples. The words μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων are by some thought to refer to the *Passion*, at which it is said, ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. By others, to his exclamation on the cross. See Hildebr. de lacrymis Christi and Braun ad h. l. Rosenm. rightly (I think) refers it to *both*. The θανάτου is by Hyperius and Abresch understood of the *fear* of death.

On the sense of εἰσακουσθεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας there has been no little difference of opinion. This has partly arisen from the extensive signification of εὐλαβ. which often denotes *reverentia*, *pietas*; and so it has been taken by the antients and many moderns, as Flaccius, Est., &c. So the Vulg. “pro sua reverentiâ.” Compare Joh. 9, 31. And ἀπὸ is often used in the sense of *ob*, *præ*, and *per*. This interpretation, however, is scarcely permitted by the context, and is liable to other objections: so that I prefer that of Ernesti, Abr., Wets., Dindorf, and Rosenm., which indeed had been before brought forward by Beza, Grot., and Hamm., and adopted by our English Translators, and after them by Doddr. and Mackn., and ably maintained by Whitby, namely, “ereptus et liberatus est ab eo timore.” This indeed is the proper, and not unfrequent, signification of εὐλαβεία. See Josh. 22, 24. and Acts 23, 10. And so Diphil, cited by Beza; θνητὸς πεφυκὼς μὴ εὐλαβοῦ τεθηκέναι. See also a cloud of examples in Wets. Thus the εἰσακουσθεῖς will be a vox prægnans, “signifying, “was heard, and delivered from:” many examples of which from the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin are adduced by Dind. and the authors referred to. Abr. compares Job 35. וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה מְנִי מִפִּי אֱלֹהִים, “and he doth not so hear him as to deliver him from the vehemence of his affliction.” This interpretation, too, is required by the context, as Cameron and others have shown. Nor is the sense, if properly explained and understood, liable to any objection. On which see Abr. and Wets.*

* Which latter Commentator observes: “Vocavit εὐλαβείαν, quam, si de alio quam de filio Dei loqueretur, dixisset δέος, ταραχήν, δειλίαν, ἀγωνίαν. Hic metus, et preces, et precum exauditiō describuntur Matth. 26. 36—42. Luc. 23, 41—45. Metus ille non erat τοῦ πνεύματος, sed τῆς ψυχῆς, ex naturâ humanâ et infirmo corpore consequens.”

8. καίπερ ὦν—ὑπακοήν. Many eminent modern Commentators regard this verse as parenthetical, and serving to restrict the sentiment couched in the preceding. See Abr., Heinr., and Dindorf. Καίπερ ὦν υἱός, “although he were a Son.” Ἐμαθεν—ὑπακοήν. These words are not to be understood as importing that he *needed to learn* that obedience; but the meaning is, as the best moderns are agreed, *discere debuit, he had to learn*; and the words are to be taken *populariter*. Thus, Dind. observes, when we familiarly say, “men learn obedience,” we only mean, that they do not *wish* to obey, and yet at length *learn* to do so. See Pisc. in loc. Now the obedience of Christ consisted in his accomplishment of all that the Father had enjoined, even to the suffering of death, for the expiation of the sins of men.

On the καίπερ Dindorf remarks: “Vulgo pater filium tractat amanter, nec cogit eum patiendo obedire; sed Deus filium tractat duriter, filium sibi carissimum.” See Pierce and Storr. In the ἔμαθεν ἀφ’ ὦν ἔπαθεν, Grot. and others observe, there is a paronomasia, and an allusion to the Greek proverb: παθήματα, μαθήματα. So Cræsus in Herod. 1, 107. τὰ δὲ μοι παθήματα τὰ ἔοντα ἀχάριστα, μαθήματα γενόμεε.

9. καὶ τελειωθείς—σωτηρίας αἰωνίου. The τελειωθείς must be understood as the τελειῶσαι διὰ παθημάτων at 2, 10. The term is used sometimes in this Epistle in the sense *to be brought to*, and *to arrive at* the height of felicity and glory. This is *not* (as some think) an *agonistical* allusion, but rather a *sacerdotal* one; though even *that* is not well established. Indeed it is unnecessary to suppose any at all.

Αἴτιος, which is a word of middle signification, here simply signifies the *cause*, or author of (as ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας); in which sense it is often employed in the best authors; though in the *later* ones it is more frequently used in *malam partem*. See the examples adduced by Wets., Kypke, and Carpz., among which is Philo 2, 440. (speaking of Noah), αἴτιος σωτηρίας. By obedience (ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ) is

meant embracing his religion, and living suitably to its precepts. The Commentators, however, think there is an allusion to the obedience of Christ mentioned at ver. 8.; q. d. “as Christ obeyed his Father, and was by him made Lord of all, so also we, if we obey Christ, shall receive eternal salvation.”

10. *προσαγορευθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ—Μελχισεδέκ.* On the sense of *προσαγ.* interpreters are not agreed. Some render it *vocatus, appellatus, nominatus*. And this, Dind. thinks, is all that it signifies. Casaub., however, renders it *salutatus*; and others, *cognominatus, proclamatus, constitutus, &c.* And this will easily appear to be the true sense, if we consider that, according to antient, and indeed modern, usage, appointment to any dignity or office is often made by the sovereign not only *in vesting* the person with a robe or ring, or other insignia of office, but by *addressing* and saluting him by the name of the office and dignity; as, for instance, in conferring the honour of knighthood.

The Apostle here (Rosenm. observes) returns to the subject commenced at ver. 6., but soon again makes a digression from it, extending to c. 7, 1.

11. *περὶ οὗ—ἀκοαῖς.* Ernesti well renders this: “De quo nobis longa foret et difficilis intellectu oratio, quoniam tardi estis.” *Περὶ οὗ*, i. e. the points of similarity between the Priesthood of Melchisedec and Jesus Christ. At *περὶ οὗ—λόγος* must be understood *ἔστι* or *ἔσται*, “there is (or would be) much more for me to say.” Now *πολὺς ἂν εἴη ὁ λόγος* was a frequent phrase, of which several examples are adduced by Abr. and Wets. *Δυσερμηνεύτος* is synonymous with *δυσεξοιστὸς* and *δυσδιήγητος*. So Artemid. On (cited by Wets.): *ὀνείροι—ποικίλοι καὶ πολλοῖς δυσερμηνευτοί*. The *λέγειν* is for the passive supine; and it is by some thought to be pleonastic. Carpz., however, (from Chrys.) observes, that the *λέγειν* is not to be understood simply, as if the difficulty were in the *doctrine* itself, but only as it regards the *Hebrews*. And this indeed is evident from, and seems

hinted at in the words following ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. With respect to the term νωθρός (whatever be its origin; for of that the Etymologists would do better to acknowledge ignorance than put forth the absurdities they do), it signifies *sluggish* and *slow of motion*; and, like many such words, was applied to the *mind*, and used to denote *dull, stupid, &c.* of which Wets. adduces copious examples. But the Apostle, per exegesis, adds ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, which is used often of the *ears of the understanding*; on which signification see Schleus. Lex.

Here, Dindorf and Rosenm. observe, commences a digression containing reproof and consolation, and which extends to the end of the next chapter. It is well remarked by Theophyl.: Μέλλων εἰς τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ἱερωσύνης καθεῖναι τὸν λόγον, πρότερον αὐτοῖς ἐπιτιμᾶ, δεικνὺς ὅτι διὰ τὸ νηπιώδες αὐτῶν τοσαῦτα ταπεινὰ ἐφθέγγετο, καὶ τῷ κατὰ σάρκα λόγῳ ἐνδιέτριψεν. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦσαν ἀσθενεῖς, πάλαι ἂν τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων ἐμνήσθη. Διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν οὖν νωθρίαν, φησι, δυσερμήνευτός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τοῦ, πῶς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. Καὶ διότι οὐ συνίετε ὑμεῖς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ καλῶς ἐρμηνεύσαι οὐ δύναμαι. So to the Corinthians, the Apostle says, he cannot “speak unto them as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, babes in Christ.”

12. καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες—τοῦ Θεοῦ. The καὶ is by some rendered *etenim*, or *præcipuè*. But this is precarious; and it is better to suppose a clause omitted, to which the γὰρ refers, and assign to καὶ its usual sense *also*, or *even*; q. d. “(And such ye are) *for* though ye ought, according to the time, to be teacher,” &c. This is, I conceive, the sense of ὀφείλοντες, a kind of *nominativus pendens*, which is best rendered by a verb and a conjunction. And so (I find) Owen. Εἶναι διδάσκαλοι is put *populariter* for *to be able to teach*. Διὰ τὸν χρόνον is well rendered *pro ratione temporis*, &c. “considering the time which ye have been learning the Christian religion.” Of this sense of διὰ τὸν χρόνον examples are adduced by Wets. and Munthe. And so the antients invariably took it.

12. πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, τίνα, &c. The general sense is clear; but there is some difficulty in exactly determining it; and that hinges on διδάσκειν and τίνα, which latter word may, according to the punctuation, be taken either with the preceding, or with the following. Most prefer the *latter* mode, and subaud τίνα in the former clause (or else με), or take διδάσκειν for διδάσκεσθαι. The sense will then be this: "teach you what are the first elements." Others take the τίνα with the former clause, cancelling the comma. This is sanctioned both by the antient and the most eminent recent Interpreters, as Arb., Pierce, J. Gronov., Mich., Heinr., Dindorf, and Rosenm., and (I think) rightly; for thus much harsh subaudition is avoided. As to με, which Grot. supplies, it cannot be approved. Τίνα is more agreeable to the Apostle's modesty, and may be rendered *one*, and either denote himself, or any fit teacher.

12. τῆς ἀρχῆς is a genitive for the cognate adjective, *the first*. Στοιχεῖα, *elementa, principles*, literally some first principles *to go upon* (from στοιχεῖν) in order to develope the details of any art or science. And the Christian religion itself, or rather the system of truths of which it consists, and which are denoted by the λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ (as 1 Pet. 4, 11.) may be said to form a kind of science; for which very reason (and would that some who have a zeal, but οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, would bear it in mind!) *civilization ought ever to precede evangelization*.

12. καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες, literally, "and ye became needing," i. e. such as to have need of. In the γάλακτος; καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς there is a metaphor by which doctrine is compared to food, occurring also in 1 Cor. 3. init. (where see the note) and 1 Pet. 2, 2. and often in the Classical writers, from whom many examples are adduced by Carpz. and Wets.*

* Thus Theophr. de c. p. 3, 16. διὸ καὶ αὐτὰ στερεᾶς τροφῆς ἐλάττονος δέεται τὰ πυκνὰ. Lucian Lexiph. 23. κατὰ τὸν τῶν ἀθλητῶν νόμον ἢ στερεῶρά σοι τροφή συνήθης ἔστω. Arrian Epict. 2, 17. οὐ θέλεις ἤδη, ὥς τὰ παιδιά, ἀπογαλακτισθῆναι, καὶ ἄπτεσθαι τροφῆς στερεωτέρας.

And many passages of very similar sentiment are adduced by both these Commentators from Philo.

Στερεὰ τροφή properly signifies *stiff*, or *solid*, food, called by Galen ἰσχυρὸν βρώμα, as that of flesh and grain in its most condensed form; the contrary to which was called βρώμα ἀσθενεστερόν, i. e. vegetables, including milk, &c. which *is* such, though formed in the stomach of an animal, and is well opposed to the στερεὶ τροφή.

13, 14. πᾶς γὰρ—κακοῦ.

At γαλάκτος must be understood *μόνον*; a very frequent ellipsis. And μετέχειν signifies, in a general way, to *live upon*, eat, &c. There is here some obscurity, occasioned by a confusion of the physical and metaphorical (or allegorical) senses, which, if kept apart, would stand as follows: "Thus (as) every one who can live only on milk is, in some sort, a babe, (so) every one who can profit only by the first elements of the Gospel, is also a babe in knowledge, and is ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης." Such appears to be the simplest mode of considering the passage, and the most effectual one of removing the difficulties, at which the Commentators strangely stumble. Here again the metaphor and sentiment are copiously illustrated by Carpz. from Philo. One passage may suffice: p. 188 E. ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μὲν ἐστὶ γάλα τροφή· τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆς γαλακτώδεις μὲν ἂν εἶεν τροφαὶ κατὰ τὴν παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν—τελείαι δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσιν εὐπρεπεῖς—αἱ ὑψηλήσεις. Schoettg. observes a similar metaphor of the Rabbins, who call learners *sugentes*, *sucklings*; which will bring to the minds of many of my readers the interesting picture of their venerable *Alma Mater Cantabr.*

As to the passages which Carpzov. gravely adduces, to prove that milk was, among the antients, a usual food for babes (elegantly, I would observe, termed by Soph. νέας τροφῆς), we may believe the fact on the authority of less weighty vouchers. It may be well to remark that milk has been, in all ages, recommended as a food fit for all *very aged* persons, and all whose powers of digestion are too weak to separate the nourishment from solid fare: and this the Apostle seems to allude to in the words following.

On the force of λόγου δικαιοσύνης there has been a variety of opinions. The most favourite one with the recent Interpreters is that of Grot. (ably supported by Abr., Rosenm., Zach., and Dind.), that it signifies *veri nominis institutio* (as *justi nominis statura*), i. e. instruction and learning, such as it should be. But this is very harsh. I am inclined to agree with the early moderns, as Beza and Owen, and, of the later Commentators, Pierce, L'Enfant, and Dodd., and of the recent ones, Heinr., that it signifies the doctrine of justification by faith, which, it is probable, they, as well as the Galatian Jewish Christians, had forgotten, or neglected. Storr thinks it signifies the doctrine of *grace*. But this is *included* in the other. Indeed, the antients, and, of the moderns, Jaspis, take it to denote *omnia sublimiora et solidiora in Christologia*.

The terms τελείων and στερεὰ τροφή, and ἔξιν, are equally adapted both to the natural and allegorical sense. Τέλειος properly signifies *adult*, of which sense examples may be seen in Schleus. Lex., to which I add an apposite passage from Artemid. 1, 16, 1. p. 30. ἀσθενεῖς γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ ἐν γάλακτι παῖδες· καὶ μὲν (read μὴν) δὴ καὶ οἱ τελεῖοι, ὅσαν νοσοῦντες τροφή μὴ δύνωνται χρῆσθαι—χρῶνται. The genitive in τελείων denotes *fitness for*. Διὰ τὴν ἔξιν, “by habit induced by long use and exercise.” For ἔξιν signifies, properly, a habit of body, and, metaphorically, a habit of mind, which *supposes* use, custom, and exercise. Τὰ αἰσθητήρια ἐχόντων, sub. ὄργανα, i. e. τὴν αἴσθησιν, as Rosenm. explains.* I should prefer τὰς αἰσθήσεις; as in a fragment of Ælian p. 1051. (Var. Hist. Gron.) By καλοῦ and κακοῦ is meant, what is true and useful, and what is false and pernicious. The whole sentence is thus elegantly paraphrased by Jaspis: “Primis rel. Chr. rudimentis debetis imbui, non plenior et altior, subtilior, sublimior, ac perfectior institutio in vos cadit; ejusmodi institutionem et quæstiones illi modo concoquere possunt, qui multo usu ac diuturnâ consuetudine exerciti internum sensum judiciumque discretivum tam bene subactum habent, et idoneam consecuti sunt animi facultatem, acrioresque sensus, ut apti sint, ad vera a falsis discernenda, utilia a noxiis separanda, et honesta ab inhonestis sejungenda.”

CHAP. VI.

VERSE 1. διὸ—φερώμεθα. Διὸ, *wherefore*. Jaspis supplies, “lest I should put you to too great shame, if I were to speak to you again of fundamental doctrines, and that ye may not always remain the same as I have described you, generally speaking, to be.” Ἀφέντες, *letting go, leaving*. Eis τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα. The φερ. is explained, by most Commentators, *se convertere*. But this is somewhat flat; and the nature of the metaphor (which is a nautical one, and used properly of a ship carried forward in full sail) requires a more forcible sense, literally, “let us *drive at*, hasten to:” which seems more worthy of the Apostle, and agreeable to the context. Much, however, depends upon the interpretation of τελειότητα, on which the modern Commentators are not agreed. Grot. understands it of the interpretation of

* And he adds: “Quanquam et *organa sensoria* rectè intelligere potes. Sicut enim in homine externo lingua, palatum, nares indicant, quæ res bonæ, quæ malæ sint, sic et homo interior sua habet αἰσθητήρια, per quæ faciliè judicat, quid verum, quid falsum.”

the figures of the Old Testament, which, by the dispensation of God, had all a bearing on the Gospel, and thither tended. Carpzov. and Dindorf understand it of the σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίᾳ, 1 Cor. 2, 6 & 7., or of Christ's priesthood, like that of Melchisedec. Others adopt other interpretations. After all, I cannot but think, with the antient and some early moderns, and also Schleus., that the τελ. denotes the same with the λόγος δίκαιος at 5, 13., where see the note.

1. μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι—Θεὸν.

In the interpretation of these words the recent Commentators run into marvellous diversities of speculation. I shall detail the simplest (and perhaps truest) interpretation, namely, that of Chrys. and Theophyl.: *τουτέστι, μὴ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιαῦτα ποιῶντες, οἷα ἐποίητε ὁπνηρίκα ἐμέλλετε βαπτίζεσθαι· οἷον τὴν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων μετανοίαν, τουτέστι, τὴν ἀποταγὴν τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Σατανᾶ. Ὁ γὰρ προσερχόμενος τῷ Χριστῷ, πρόδηλον ὅτι μετανοῶν ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ καὶ δόγματι καὶ βίῳ, οὕτω πρόσεισιν· εἰ μὴ γὰρ καταγινῶ τοῦ προτέρου, πῶς τοῦ δευτέρου ἄψεται; διὸ ἐπάγει, καὶ πίστεως; ἐπὶ Θεῷ.* Now the elementary observances of our religion are considered as a *foundation*, on which the more recondite and difficult doctrines are to be built: an architectural metaphor. In which view Carpzov. cites Philo 1187. *ἀρχὴν βαλλόμενος ὥσπερ θεμέλιον*, and elsewhere. And Dind. compares Ephr. Syr. T. 2, 74. *βαλεῖν καλῶς ἀρχὴν*. Abr. and Dind., however, observe, that the enumeration of important doctrines subjoined is not to be considered as complete; since others, not here mentioned (as in similar enumerations at 1 Cor. 15, 3 & 4. 1 Thess. 1, 9 & 10. Tit. 2, 11—14.), are reckoned ἐν τοῖς πρωτοῖς: and, indeed, such a certain and definite enumeration of the initiatory and elementary doctrines of Christianity is no where to be found in Scripture. And further, that *καταβ. μετανοίας* cannot mean *lay a foundation* for repentance, but *lay a foundation quod constat articuli de emendatione.*" See the excellent note of Ernesti.

With respect to the νεκρὰ ἔργα, all are agreed that they mean *evil deeds*, as being νεκρὰ, i. e. bringing misery, viz. spiritual death. So Philo p. 60. (cited by Carpzov.) *ὁ δὲ ψυχῆς θάνατος, ἀρετῆς μὲν φθόρα ἐστὶ, κακίας δὲ ἀνάληψις*. See Rom. 7, 10. And Rosenm. observes that so Symmachus interprets the denunciation at Gen. 2, 17. *θνητὸς ἔση*. Abr. compares Acts 14, 5. & 3, 26. And Gatak. Adv. c. 31. had observed that *μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ τινος* is a *phrasis præg-nans*. On the subject itself see Braun.

By *πίστις ἐπὶ Θεὸν* is meant faith in God as He is revealed to us in the Gospel of Christ, in whom the promises of a Messiah were fulfilled. See Abr., Carpz., and Rosenm.

2. *βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, &c.* The *διδαχῆς* is pleonastic. On *βαπτισμῶν* the Commentators are not

agreed. Ernesti thinks it is the plural for the singular; as οὐρανῶν and οἰκτιρμῶν elsewhere. Which, Dindorf says, may be true: but asks whence the plural? Grot., Braun., and others, think the plural has reference to its two-fold nature, internal and external. See also Lord Barrington. Rosenm. explains it of the many spiritual washings prescribed by the law, both for purposes of cleanliness and religion, especially the baptism of proselytes, to which Christ's baptism bore some resemblance. Now to know the difference between these was the first foundation of Christ's religion. Others, as Limborch and Dindorf, think there is reference to the baptism of John (and perhaps of proselytes), as compared with that of Christ. I must confess that I see no ground on which to form any decided opinion.

The ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν involves less difficulty, for, with the exception of some who refer it to the Jewish χειροθεσία at the day of expiation, the best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that it must have reference to the laying on of hands, which, in that age, accompanied baptism,* as a symbol of the spiritual gifts vouchsafed to many of the primitive Christians. And so, at ver. 4., there is mention made τῶν μετόχων γεννηθέντων πνεύματος ἁγίου.

The ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν is by some, as Gerhard, Sclater, Estius, and Rosenm., understood of the resurrection only of the *just*, and therefore to *happiness*. But this is a very groundless fancy. It is surprising that none of the more recent Commentators should have seen that it is refuted, and the common interpretation placed beyond doubt by the

* On which Jaspis remarks: "Ritus antiquissimus, Gen. 48, 14. Num. 27, 18 seqq. 2 Reg. 5, 11. primis rel. chr. doctoribus usitatissimus, *vel* ad morbos sanandos, Marc. 16, 8. Act. 9, 12 & 17. *vel* ad homines novo muneri inaugurandos (ut idem esset ac χειροτονεῖν, Act. 13, 23.), Act. 6, 6. 8, 17 & 18. 1 Tim. 4, 14. 2 Tim. 1, 6. *vel* ad eximenda peccata, *vel* ad impertienda dona illa planè singularia seu πνεῦμα ἅγιον conferendum in Christianos. Act. 8, 17. 19, 6. Quare in veteri ecclesiâ manuum impositio cum baptismi ritu conjuncta fuit."

words of the Apostle himself in his speech before Felix, Acts 24, 15., where, in a confession of his faith, he says: ἐλπὶδα ἔχων—ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι νεκρῶν, δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδικῶν.

3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν, ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ Θεός. The antients (see Theophyl.) and most eminent moderns, are agreed that these words have reference to the ἐπὶ τῇ τελειότητι φεράμεθα of ver. 1., and signify: “And now, with God’s permission and help, we proceed to this explanation of the more sublime doctrines of the Gospel, especially as they regard the Old Testament, and its accommodation to Christ, or the comparison of the history and economy of the old covenant with those of the new.” Jaspis paraphrases thus: “Vos in ipsa allegoriarum adyta introducam, fusius delegam, quid ex totâ V. T. œconomiâ ad Christum accommodari possit, ut hujus personæ summa dignitas inde eluceat, ac præstantia et salubritas ejus operis inde intelligatur.” As to the interpretation of Grot. and Hamm., as detailed by Whitby, it is utterly inadmissible. Theophyl. rightly observes on the ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ Θεός, that the Apostle says this, not as though God would not *per-**mit* this, but as being accustomed to use such formulas of dependance on Divine Providence.

4, 5, 6. These verses are closely united: but their connection with the preceding is not easy of determination. Perhaps the mode of tracing it proposed by Heinrich may be the best: “Neque enim tam facile est negotium, iterum tradere et commendare alicui ea quæ jam respicit.” Rosenm. thinks the Apostle means to say that his business is not with *apostates*, such as there were then among the Jews (see 10, 26.), nor would he, for their sakes, repeat the first elements of religion, presuming that would be in vain; for it cannot be that such men should be *reformed*, being like bad ground, on which whatever is sown, is thrown away.” This view (nearly that taken by Ernesti) is approved by Dind.

By ἀδυνατόν, all the best Commentators are agreed, is meant, not *physical*, but *moral* impossibility, or rather, by a popular hyperbole, *extreme difficulty*. And so, Dind. remarks, it is rendered in the Old Vulg. *difficile*. And so Theophyl. explains it of such a degree of difficulty as to cause just despair. And this sense *perquam difficile et prope modum impossibile*, I have often met with in the Classical writers. Thus the disputes on this expression between the Calvinists, Lutherans, Arminians, &c. prove mere logomachies.

Φωτισθέντας, "fully instructed, imbued with Gospel truths." A metaphor occurring in 2 Cor. 4, 46., &c. This signification Dind. has learnedly, but needlessly, discussed; since no one can doubt or hesitate about it. It is a more interesting question whether the word is to be understood of *baptism*. So the antients seem invariably to have taken it. Hence the primitive Fathers frequently use φωτίζω and its derivatives. This interpretation has, however, been objected to by most modern Commentators. The chief arguments they use are, that here, and in the parallel passage of 10, 26. φωτίζεσθαι signifies λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας; that it much lowers the dignity of the sentiment; and that there was no reason why any express mention should be made of *baptism*; since those who are here adverted to may be supposed to have been already baptized; nor could the benefits spoken of accrue to others. But these seem not very forcible arguments. And I should be inclined, with Whitby, to prefer the antient interpretation. But, in order to reconcile the antient and modern opinions, we should bear in mind the peculiar dispensation of the Gospel under which Christians of that age lived, and which would authorize *that* to be *then* said of baptism which could not be said of it in any other age. It is strange the Commentators should not have thought of this, which will best account for the μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου. Other modes of reconciling the discrepancy may be seen in Est., Hyper., Limb., and Doddr. But they seem precarious.

Γευσαμένους τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, enjoyed. A metaphor not uncommon in the Classical writers, especially in the figurative writings of Philo. See Carpz. The πνεύματος may be (as it is by many) understood of the *ordinary* influences of the Holy Spirit; but it *here* seems far more *natural* to understand it of the *extraordinary* ones (see Grot.) which were supposed to follow, and often *did* follow, baptism. See Abr. The καλὸν ῥῆμα Θεοῦ is commonly explained the *Gospel covenant*, and the promises of resurrection, and eternal happiness. Theodoret explains ὑπόσχεσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν. And so Abr. Other interpretations are proposed by Pierce, Ern., Mich., and Carpz. ingenious, but precarious; and indeed so flexible is the term, that to fully *determine* its meaning is very difficult. But I prefer the first mentioned interpretation, i. e. the Gospel, Christ's religion, which is supported by the authority of all the antients and, of the moderns, by Wets., Rosenm., Heinr., and Dind., who compare the Hebr. דבר טוב in Jer. 29, 10. 33, 14. This construction, with the accusative instead of the genitive, is sometimes found in the Classical writers.

Δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Here again the sense is dubious; and hence various are the interpretations that have been proposed (which see in Dind.). Some antients and early moderns, and, of the recent ones, Storr, interpret this of the miraculous ἐνεργήματα of the primitive Christians; and they take μελλ. αἰῶνος of the times of the Messiah. Others suppose the words to mean, what the Gospel can effect in making us happy. Rosenm. renders, "had a foretaste of the benefit of eternal life." All these, and some other

interpretations, yield a good sense, but are liable to various objections. One thing seems certain, that *μελλ. αἰῶνος* must be understood of the *future world*, or eternal life. I would therefore conjecture that this may mean "the powerful supports of eternal life," i. e. of the *Gospel* which reveals it.

Καὶ παραπεσόντας—*παραδειγματίζοντας*. The term *παραπίπτειν* signifies properly to *fall aside*, and, like the Hebr. כפל and למע, is sometimes used (as here) of *falling away* from religious faith and profession. Abresch compares 2 Chron. 29, 19., where למע is rendered ἐν τῇ ἀποστασίᾳ. And in Suidas Adam is called ὁ παραπεσών. And in Polyb. we have παραπεσών τῆς ἀληθείας. In *παλὶν ἀνακαινίζειν* there is what appears a pleonasm; though such are not unusual in antient and modern languages (and examples are adduced by Abresch); indeed they sometimes, as here, tend to *strengthen* the sense. With respect to the *ἀνακαινίζειν*, this term is found in the later writers; as Joseph., Philo, and Appian; and sometimes signifies to *thoroughly repair*, as used of houses, or garments, and has occasionally a metaphorical sense. The critics, however, are not agreed whether we are to here subaud *ἐαυτοὺς* (as does Carpz.), or take it for *ἀνακαινίσεσθαι*; as does Abr., understanding the *Apostle himself*, or some *other teacher*. And Abr. thinks this may be done, even though the active sense be retained. It should seem, however, to be a matter of indifference whether the active, or the passive sense be adopted, so that no *improper stress* be laid upon the pronoun; for it seems to be a reflected verb. As to the *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, there is no occasion to take *εἰς* in the unusual sense of *διὰ*, but regard the verb *ἀνακαινίζειν*, as a *vox prægnans*, importing *reform* and *come to repentance*.

The next words assign another reason why it is most difficult for them to come to reformation, *seeing that they have crucified*, &c. (*ἀνασταυρῶντας* being for a verb and conjunction.) The best modern critics are agreed that the *ἀνα* has no force; and they adduce many examples of such a use. And certainly, from the very nature of the signification of this verb, that may very well be admitted. They have shewn by examples, that neither in this verb nor in *ἀνασκελετίζειν* has the *ἀνα* any force. The common opinion seems to have arisen from a well meant, but mistaken, piety, as if to place such apostacy in the very worst light. The *ἐαυτοῖς* signifies *quantum in se*; for (as Grot. observes) they are said to *do* what they *approve*. Morus renders, "to their detriment." *Παραδειγματίζειν* signifies to make an example of any one, by bringing him to punishment, and thereby to *shame*; and sometimes means no more than *υβριζειν*. It was, however, often associated with verbs denoting public punishment, as here; and this is all that need be attended to. The sense is unnecessarily refined on by the critics. See, however, Dind. It is rightly observed by Rosenm., that *apostates*, and not *evil living Christians*, are here meant. And it may be added, that apostates, by their desertion of the faith, represented the crucifixion as just, and therefore did thus especially put the Son of God to open shame.

7, 8. γὰρ—ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The Apostle now depicts, by a beautiful image, the condition of those who, enjoying the exuberance of Christian doctrine, apply this blessing to a good use; as contrasted with those who put it to a *bad* one. By this the extreme difficulty of conversion in apostacy is placed in a yet stronger light. (Dind.) The apodosis is here omitted; since the application is obvious.

Of this figurative sense of πίνειν and πίπτειν the philologists adduce numerous examples; and I have myself collected several: but it is unnecessary to introduce any, since such a figure is common even in modern languages. Βοτάνη, like the Hebr. נֶשֶׁת (See Schleus. Lex.) denotes all the fruits of the earth, both grass and corn. Εὐθετον, *properly fitted, or fit*; also *beneficial* and *useful*. Γεωργεῖται is well rendered, by whom it is *dressed*; having reference both to grazing and agriculture. Thus our term *husbandman* has reference to both. Μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας α. π. Θ., “enjoys God’s blessing in a plentiful produce.” So 2 Cor. 9, 6. “the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed.” This is the usual language both of the Old and New Testament, by which is inculcated the dependance of human labour on Divine aid and blessing. Μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας is an elegant term for εὐλογεῖται. The application is obvious, on which see Chrys., Theophyl., and others. But it must not be traced too minutely.

Ἐκφέρουσα. This is simply a variation of expression for τίκτουσα. Ἀδόκιμος, *rejectanea*. The sense of the whole clause may be thus expressed: “is held despicable, and almost *abandoned with a curse* (for with *that* such abandonment is usually accompanied), and whose end (if it be converted to use) is to be burnt.” Ἀδόκιμος is used of whatever is rejectaneous, whether *money* that *will not pass*, or, in a general way, what men (as we say) would not have as a gift. The ἐγγὺς is usually rendered *propediem*, and taken of *time*. But I prefer the version of others, “*execrationi affinis*,” or Anglicè, “is almost

ready to be abandoned with a curse ;” or, as others explain, “ is called accursed ;” a name given sometimes to *barren fields* by the antients. At ἡς το τέλος εἰς καῦσιν, the simplest ellipsis is ἐστι. And the Commentators in the εἰς καῦσιν notice a Hebraism, like ליהיה. So Is. 44, 15. ἵνα ἡ ἀνθρώποις εἰς καῦσιν. The εἰς καῦσιν, stands for the infinitive passive. The *burning*, of course, applies, as Rosenm. says, not to the *land*, but what grows upon it. Yet it is absurd to extend it, as he does, to the *farm-house* and *trees*; for however weary a husbandman might be of the expense, it would do no good to burn his house and the timber. But indeed the *house* is out of the question; and as to *trees*, such land seldom produces any. The burning here spoken of has reference to what *grows* on the land, as bushes, thorns, thistles and weeds, which, when burnt up by the roots, leave the soil clear, and manure it for a better produce. The application is obvious; but must be traced with caution and judgment.

9. πεπείσμεθα—σωτηρίας. The Apostle now (as often) tempers severity with mildness, and uses language expressive of hope in them: for considering what precedes, πεπείσμαι can import no more than a *good hope*; and such is the popular use of this and similar words in all languages. Ὑμῶν, too, does not necessarily imply *all without exception*. So Theophyl: φησιν οὖν, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς κατεγνακῶς ὑμῶν, ταῦτα λέγω, οὐδὲ ὡς νομίζων ὑμᾶς ἀκανθῶν πλήρεις, ἀλλὰ δεδοικῶς ἵνα μὴ τοῦτο γένηται.

On the ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας the Commentators run into strange diversities; some regarding the ἐχόμενα as pleonastic; others taking the σωτ. of *temporal deliverance*. But the former is unsupported by the usage of Scripture, and of the Apostle; and the latter is at variance with the context. Others again, as Schleus., take the τὰ ἐχόμενα to denote *constancy, perseverance*. But this is so harsh as to deserve no attention. The σωτ. must denote *salvation*; and it is strange the Commentators should not have seen

that the ἐχόμενα is an expression suited to the delicacy of the Apostle, and the uncertainty which he felt respecting their future conduct. His meaning is, that he (hopes and) trusts he shall see in them at least actions which are *connected* with salvation, as leading to those higher advances in religion and virtue which immediately tend to it.

Εἰ γὰρ οὕτω λαλοῦμεν is a *formula mitigandi* of frequent occurrence.

10. οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος—ἀγάπης. The Apostle now adverts to the *cause* for that hope and trust, namely, as seated in the *support of God*, the author of constancy and every other good work.

The κόπου is omitted in a few MSS. and Versions; and thrown out of the text by the recent Editors; but (I think) on insufficient grounds. The MSS. in question are such as have passed through the hands of the *corrector*, and the emendation here arose from over nicety. But though the κόπου has somewhat of inelegance, yet it strengthens the sense; and though the Critics think it has been introduced from 1 Thess. 1, 3., yet it were strange that it should have crept into nearly all the MSS. Indeed the κόπου must be retained; and its genuineness is defended by Dind.

The ἄδικος is used with reference to the condescension and benignity of God towards men. See Ernesti. On the hendiadis in τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, I would compare Soph. Aj. 536., ἐπὶ ἡμεῖς ἔργον καὶ πρόνοιαν, ἣν ἔθου Eurip. Phœn. 189., φόβος, εἰ πείσω—μόχθου δὲ χάριν τήνδε ἐπιδώσω. It is remarked by Rosenm.; “Justitiæ est implere promissa, quare Deus injustus aliquo modo dici posset, si non staret promissis. Obliviscitur autem, qui non remuneratur.” Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, “towards him, in his cause and for his sake.” Διακονέω is here (as often) used of all those offices of humanity, hospitality, and kindness active and passive, by which the wants of Christian brethren are supplied, and their comfort promoted.

11. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν—τέλους. We have here only to remark, that ἡ πληροφορία τῆς ἐλπίδος is used (like the same phrase at 10, 2., and πληροφορία τῆς συνέσεως at Col. 2, 2.) to denote *spes certissima*, “in order to your having a firm and sure hope unto the end.”

12. ἵνα μὴ—ἐπαγγελίας, “That ye be not (as hitherto) dull and remiss (in that firmness of hope), but be imitators of those who, through faith and constancy, have attained the promises.” Μακροθυμία, “constancy and patient endurance;” as Col. 1, 11., where see the note. Κληρονομοῦντων. Participle Imperfect. The word here (as often) signifies to *obtain*. Ἐπαγγελίας, “the benefits promised.”

13. τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ—καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ. By the ἐπαγγελιάμενος the Apostle means what is mentioned at ver. 14.; and he takes occasion, from the promise to Abraham, to speak of the firmness of the Divine will and purpose, which he illustrates from an oath. Philo, too (referring to Gen. 22, 16 & 17.), says, only “sware by himself.” (Rosenm.)

14. λέγαν—πληθυνῶ σε. The ἦ μὴν is a common *formula jurandi*, both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers. The passage here adverted to is from Gen. 22, 17., Sept., except that for πληθυνῶ σε, there is πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου. The σε, however, may very well include the σπέρμα, or *posterity*. The use of the verb and Participle has usually (as here) an emphatic and intensive force.

15. καὶ οὕτω—ἐπαγγελίας, “And thus (by this constancy of faith) he obtained the promised benefits, both temporal, (in a numerous offspring) and eternal, (in the admission to that salvation he looked forward to).” See Hebr. 11, 10. This, Dind. observes, must show us, that we may very well confide in God’s promises, though we may not comprehend the *mode* in which he will perform them.

16. ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὁμνύουσι. The connection is here obscure, and hence various have been the modes of tracing it, for which I must refer the reader to Dind. and Rosenm. By the τοῦ

μείζωνος is supposed to be meant *God*. The construction is thus laid down by Rosenm. : καὶ ὁ ὅρκος εἰς βεβαίωσιν (sc. προσθετὸς s. προστιθέμενος) ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς πέρας πάσης ἀντιλογίας. He takes the καὶ in the sense *ut* ; and explains ἀντιλογία *cogitatio in contrarium*, or *dubitatio* ; as 7, 7. Yet I prefer the common interpretation, *contradiction*, or *strife*. Theoph. well explains thus : ἐκ τοῦ ὅρκου λύεται πάσης ἀντιλογίας ἀμφισβήτησις· καὶ γὰρ λέγονται μὲν πολλὰ, καὶ ἀνιλέγονται ἐξ ἑκατέρου μέρους, ὁ δὲ ὅρκος τελευταῖος ἐπεισιῶν καὶ βεβαίων, τὰ ἀμφίβολα λύει πάντα. I would compare Liban. Or. 97 B., τὸ τὴν ἀμφισβητησιμὸν πέρας· and 190, A.

17. ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον—ὅρκῳ. The ἐν ᾧ is plainly for διὰ τοῦτο *wherefore*. So Theophyl. explains it διὰ. And he adds : ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὁ ὅρκος πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐπιφέρει, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὀμνυσιν. The general sense is what Hardy (from the early moderns) lays down ; q. d. “Though a simple *promise* of blessing would have sufficed, yet God, *ex abundantia*, interposed an oath.” So Theophyl. observes, that the Almighty swore by *himself*, in order to abundantly assure us that he will unalterably keep, and certainly perform, all that He promises. God’s swearing was, therefore, from condescension to human infirmity. Ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, literally, “he interposed with an oath,” i. e. as the Vulg. well renders *interposuit iusjurandum*. I would here compare Soph. Electr. 47.

18. ἵνα διὰ δύο—ἐλπίδος. By the two *immutable things* the best Commentators, antient and modern, understand the *promise* of God, of itself immutable (See Rom. 11, 29.), and the *oath* of God, added in condescension to human infirmity. Πεύσασθαι, *fidem fallere*. Rosenm. observes, “improprie dicitur ψεύδεσθαι, cujus verbis aliquis fallitur, ideo quod ea intelligit.” The promise and oath were both so plain as to admit of no mistake. Ἴνα has here the *eventual* sense. The παράκλησιν is by some antients and moderns explained *adhortationem*. But the

common rendering, *consolation*, is far more suitable to the words following. At the *καταφυγόντες* Commentators stumble. But it is only necessary to consider this as two clauses blended into one, i. e. “to take refuge in any hoped for place of security that lies before us,” and “to cling to it.” Rosenm. supplies *πρὸς*, or *εἰς τὸ*. The metaphor in *κρατῆσαι* is (as the Commentators remark) a nautical one, like that in the next verse, and signifies, to lay hold of and cling to any thing, as a drowning mariner does to a rope. It is here well remarked by Rosenm., that the oath of God to *Christians*, here meant, is to be sought in the example of Abraham, proposed for our instruction. Whence we may learn, that God, if He wishes, or intends any thing or promise, does it *animo serio*. “Now God has promised many things to us Christians. Therefore, our hope is as certain as if God had confirmed the promise by an oath.” Perhaps, too, there is a reference to what is said at 7, 21. For, while God promised to Christ the Priesthood by an oath, He promised to us the eternal salvation to be attained by this our High Priest.

19, 20. *ἣν ὡς ἔχομεν—καταπετάσματος*. The *ἣ* and *εἰσερχομένην*, are by some referred to *παράκλησιν*: by others, to *ἐλπίδα*; which mode of interpretation is adopted by the antients, and the most eminent moderns. The *ἔχομεν* is well explained, by Abr. and Dind., *κατέχομεν*, *keep hold of*; citing from an anonymous writer, ap. Chrys.: *κατέχειν τὴν ἄγκυραν τοῦ πνεύματος*. With respect to the metaphor, nothing is more frequent among the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Palaiet, Kypke, and Wets., to which I add Aristoph. Eg. 1244., Æschyl, Ag. 488., Eurip. H. F. 105., Artemid. On. 2, 23., Heliod. 2, 199 & 172. From this, however, it must not be inferred that St. Paul had read the Greek Classics, for the expression seems to have been proverbial (See Erasm. Adag.); as *ἐν πείσῃ καρδίᾳ τηρεῖν* (See Blomf. on Æschyl. Pers. 68.); and even on *coins* hope was sometimes represented

under the symbol of an anchor. So Appian, 1, 620., εἰπεῖν ἀσφαλείας τὴν ἄγκυραν εἶναι σύμβολον. By *hope*, is meant, “the mind fraught with hope.”

Καὶ εἰσερχομένην is best rendered by a verb and relative, “and which entereth,” &c. The καταπέτασμα was the thick veil, or curtain, which separated the Sanctum from the Sanctum Sanctorum; though there is reason (from the Old Testament, Josephus, and Philo) to suppose that there were *two* veils placed nearly together, of which, the one turned towards the Sanctum Sanctorum was called the καταπέτασμα; the other, towards the Sanctum, the κάλυμμα. See Philo, 667, c. and the other authors cited by Dind. Thus, “to enter into this inner curtain,” signifies, to enter the *place it separates* from the rest of the temple, i. e. the Sanctum Sanctorum, by which is here plainly meant *heaven*; as 8, 2., and 9, 11.; a *typical* sense also found in Philo and Josephus, the former of whom, 291, has εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον καταπέτασμα. And so Carpz. and Braun. The force of the whole expression is well illustrated by Theophyl. Thus: Λέγει ὅτι καὶ ἡχομένην αὐτὰ τῇ ἐλπίδι. Αὕτη γὰρ εἰσέλθουσα ἔνδον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἥδη εἶναι ἐν τοῖς ἐπαγγελμένοις, καὶ ἔτι κάτω ὤμεν, καὶ μὴπω ἐλάβομεν. Τοσαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν ἡ ἐλπίς, ὥστε τοὺς ἐπιγείους οὐρανίους ποιεῖν.

20. ὅπου πρόδρομος—αἰῶνα, “whither our precursor, forerunner,” &c.

On προέδομος Dindorf has a learned note, which he concludes by observing that εἰσῆλθεν πρόδρομον is a mere periphrasis for εἰσῆλθεν πρὸ ἡμῶν; as πρόδρομος ἦλθε is for προῆλθε in Æschyl. Theb. 217. But to this I must demur. The usage of a *Poet* will prove nothing: and προῆλθε must there mean *prævertit*; as it is rendered by Bp. Blomfield. Though that is nothing to our present purpose. And as to Charit. 3, 6. (cited by Dind.) where ships which have arrived first of a fleet, are called πρόδρομοι (to which may be added Eurip. Andr. 854., πρωτοπλοῦς πλάτα), such passages are inapposite, since the context here requires something *more*. The word προδραμεῖν, as Carpz. remarks, is often used of running forward, to deliver a message, make preparation, &c. And, he might have added, that in this very sense the word occurs in Eurip. Iph. Aul. 424. Ἐγὼ δὲ πρόδρομος, σῆς παρασκευῆς χάριν, ἦκω. Now this use of πρόδρομος (as the antients and best moderns have seen) is here very

applicable. A *πρόδρομος*, (Theophyl. observes,) supposes *some to follow him*, and in no long time. It supposes, too, the possibility of entering being *ascertained*, and preparation made for those that follow. The best Commentary on this passage is Joh. 14, 2., "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." And so Carpz., who has here best seen the sense. As to the explanation of Mich. and Rosenm., *principatus*, that is a too great lowering of the sense; and though they compare 2, 10., ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, yet that passage is not to the purpose; for it has been proved that the sense there is not *captain* of our salvation, but *author* of our salvation. Hence it is clear that ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν was used κατ' ἐπεξήγησιν, and must mean, "on our behalf, for our sakes and benefit, by the preparation made, through his intercession for us with the Father, &c." See Chrys. and Theophyl.

CHAP. VII.

After a long digression, the Apostle returns to his subject, and *explains* the passage of Ps. 110, 4., which he had brought forward, supra, 5, 6 & 10.; and after removing the doubt which might seem to hinder him from treating of the sublime doctrines of the allegories and types of Christ, he especially labours to convince them of the authority, prerogatives, and exalted Priesthood of Melchisedec. (Dind., Rosenm., and Jaspis). In this Chapter is contained a type of Melchisedec, accommodated to Christ. It consists of two parts. 1st., From 1—10., the type is described and explained; first, his *Priesthood*, simply 1—3., and then its *excellence*, 4—10. 2dly., From 11 fin. the type is transferred to Christ, and the superiority of his priesthood over Aaron's is demonstrated.

VERSE 1. οὕτως γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, &c. The γὰρ, as Pierce and others have seen, is resumptive, and has reference to 5, 10. It is plain that the verb to οὕτως ὁ Μελχισεδέκ is *not* (as some fancy) ἐστι understood, but μένει at ver. 3. On the *story* of Melchisedec and Abraham, as here referred to, see Gen. 14, 18. Some, indeed, have doubted whether such a

person did really exist, and, consequently, whether this be a proper name. But that notion has been discountenanced by almost every judicious Commentator. It is justly remarked by Ernesti, that "*Historical* narrations (such as this) are not to be taken *allegorically*, but in their plain grammatical sense; otherwise the Scripture would become mere wax, to be moulded *any* way." This, therefore, is a proper name, and of the same form with Adonizedec and others. Now Melchisedec was (according to the most antient custom) at once King and Priest. A full account of him may be seen in Carpz. Appar. Antig. Sacr. Cod. 1, 4., p. 52., and Dind.*

On the region meant by *Salem* Commentators are little agreed. That it is the same with *Jerusalem*, was the opinion of Josephus and almost all the antients. And so most moderns, especially Reland, and recently Michaelis. Others, however, as Carpz., Heinr., and Dindorf, think it was *not* Jerusalem. Carpzov. and Rosenm. say it was occupied by the Jebusees, or was the capital of that region, not far from the plain which was first called the valley of Siddem, and afterwards the Dead Sea, where Sodom and Gomorrah, Adar and Zeboim, were situated, which city (*Salem*) being, in after times, perhaps destroyed, ceased to exist, or took another name. See Whitby and Mackn.

1. ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραάμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς

* The latter distributes the opinions into two classes. 1st. That of those who supposed him to be a *Divine* being, 2dly, a *created* one. The *former* was maintained by some antient fanatics, as the Hieracritæ, Melchisedeciani, and Ambrose; nay, even some moderns, as Molinæus, Gaillard, Hottinger, Starck, &c. 2nd., That of some (as Origen and Didymus) who supposed him to be an *Angel*. Most Commentators, however, suppose him to have been a *man*. Some say *Enoch*; others, *Shem*; others, *Job*. All which opinions are evidently open to objection. The best founded seems to be that of Carpz., and most judicious moderns (and also Josephus) that he was a *principal* person among the Canaanites and the posterity of Noah, and eminent for his holiness and justice; and, therefore, discharged the Priestly as well as regal functions among the people.

τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὸν. The κοπήs may mean *cutting in pieces, slaughter*: but as κόπτειν often signifies no more than to *beat*, i. e. to *defeat*, so κοπή perhaps here merely mean *defeat*. I would refer to an important passage in Joseph. 1292, 28. The εὐλόγησας αὐτὸν most recent Commentators take to mean no more than *congratulated* him. And Schleus. adduces as examples of this signification Luke 2, 34. and Tob. 9, 6. But neither of these passages will prove it. The *latter* is not to the purpose; and in the former the word may well admit of that extent of signification which the antients and earlier moderns are agreed in ascribing to it in the *present* passage, and which, indeed, the words of Genesis *require*. Ernesti has here an excellent note, the substance of which is as follows: “Εὐλογεῖν, in the best Classical writers, signifies, 1st, to *praise*. 2dly. In the New Testament, like בָּרַךְ, it signifies *ἀγιάζειν, to ascribe holiness to any thing by prayer*, and, as spoken of a *person*, *alicui bene ominari, precari, alicui promittere et prædicare auctoritate Divina*; and such is the sense *here*. Now this kind of εὐλογία could only be pronounced either by *God*, as Gen. 1, 28., or by men divinely inspired (at least for the time); as was Jacob when he blessed his sons.” In the same way (I would add) the passage of Luke above mentioned is to be understood: for Simeon was then (as we learn from the Evangelist) ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, i. e. *divinely inspired*; and at ver. 25. it is said: καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν. I trust, therefore, I have shown that this *was* (though Rosenm. denies it) a *sacerdotal benediction*.

2. ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ. By the πάντων are, of course, meant πάντ. ἀκροθινίων, which is *expressed* in Joseph. Ant. 1, 2., and indeed *infra*, ver. 4. In vain do Heinr. and Dindorf endeavour to represent this as merely an interchange of presents by courtesy between two princes. And Heinr. thinks the proportion, namely, a *tenth*, was

merely *accidental*; the improbability of which it were needless to point out.* That this was far different from an interchange of courtesy is plain from the *Apostle*; and that the *tenth* was not accidental is *evident* from the *extreme antiquity* of this custom of all nations of making these grateful offerings, and that in this *very proportion*.† To the passages cited by the Commentators and Ecclesiastical Antiquaries, I could add several from Herodot., Thucyd., &c.; but it is not necessary. I would moreover observe that the nature of the term ἐμέρισας evidently *requires* this interpretation; and the words of Genesis are such as to *permit no other*.

2. πρῶτον μὲν ἐρμηνευόμενος—εἰρήνης. The best mode of taking these words is to consider them as elliptical, and (with Carpzov) to be thus supplied: Πρῶτον μὲν ἐρμηνευόμενος ἐστὶ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ βασιλεὺς Δικαιοσύνης· ἔπειτα δ' ἐστὶ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ ὃ ἐστὶ ἐρμηνευόμενον Βασιλεὺς Εἰρήνης. And so Heinr.

3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ. It is rightly observed, by Dind. and Rosenm. (and this, indeed, others before them had seen), that Melchisedec is so called, because his name was not preserved in the genealogies, as is apparent from the following ἀγενεαλόγητος, which is exegetical of the preceding. And Dindorf ascribes the merit of this interpretation to A. Morus. But it is due to Chrys. and Theophyl.; and such, we may suppose, was the interpretation of the early Christians; since we find, in the very antient Syriac

* A similar misconception is guarded against by Theophyl. thus: (p. 936.) Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὡς συστρατευσαμένῳ καὶ συμπονήσαντι ἀπεμέρισέ τινα ἀμοιβὴν τοῦ καμάτου, ἀλλ' οἴκοι καθημένῳ. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ προεῖπεν ἄνωτέρῳ, ὅτι συνήντησε τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων.

† Parkhurst, Heb. Lex. in v. תְּשֻׁבָּה, thinks that from the well-known practice of the Heathens in various and distant countries (for which he refers to Spelman on Tythes, c. 26. Seld., c. 3. and Lesley's Divine Right of Tythes, §. 7.) of dedicating tythes (i. e. tenths) to their Gods, there is no room to doubt but that this religious custom was as antient as the dispersion of Babel, and even made a part of the Patriarchal religion before the Deluge.

Version, "cujus nec pater nec mater scripti sunt in genealogiis." Now in this respect Melchisedec was inferior to the Levitical Priests. And thus also his anti-type, Christ, was ἀγενεαλόγητος.

The words μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς are (it should seem) *also* exegetical, and are to be understood of the Mosaic annals, and perhaps of some other *early chronologies* preserved in the temple, sometimes alluded to by Josephus. This seems to be the simplest mode of interpretation; though many others have been proposed, which may be seen in Pole, Wolf, and Dindorf.

3. ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. On the sense of these words there have been numerous opinions. Dindorf offers the following interpretation: "his de causis dicitur ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, assimilatus in eâ re filio Dei: quod et filius Dei fuit sacerdos, sed non e tribu Leviticâ; quod filius Dei dicitur neque initium vitæ habere neque finem, et sacerdos perpetuus manere, in eo quodammodo similitudinem habet cum Melchisedeco, sed alio sensu omnia de Christo dicuntur." On the last words no determination can well be made. See Dindorf. Perhaps the opinion of some antients, as Theophyl., may be as near the truth as any: Μελχισεδέκ ἀτελεύτητον λέγεται ἔχειν τὴν ἱερωσύνην, οὐχ' ὅτι ζῇ αἰεὶ ἐτεθνήκει γὰρ ἀμὰ καθὼς οὐκ ἐμφέρεται τῇ γραφῇ τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐντεῦθεν ἔχοιμεν γινώσκειν, πότε ἡ ἱερωσύνη αὐτοῦ ἐπαύσατο. Upon the whole, great judgment must be used in the adjustment of the type and anti-type.

4. θεωρεῖτε—πατριάρχης. After having adapted the *figure* to the *reality*, i. e. the things of Melchisedec to Christ, he shows that the figure, or type (Melchisedec) is of greater dignity than those really Priests among the Jews, nay, even their Patriarch himself. But if the *type* be greater than these, how much more will the *reality*, even the High Priest Christ? (Theophyl.)

Θεωρεῖτε, "consider well, attentively reflect." 'Ο

πατριάρχης, "the founder of the nation." So Philo : ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ ἔθνους, & πολλῶν ἔθνων πατήρ. On the ἀκροθινία the moderns are not agreed whether we are to understand the whole of the spoils taken from the enemy, or only those which had fallen to the share of Abraham, as chief. The *former* is the opinion of Hamm., Raphel, Kypke, Ernesti, Carpzov, and Michaelis. And this Philo and Josephus seem to countenance, by only using the general term λεία. But for this sense there is no direct authority; and as to the *thing itself*, probability is adverse to it. I am therefore inclined to adopt the interpretation of Chrys. and Theophyl., and also of most moderns, who take ἀκροθ. in its most usual sense, as denoting the τὸ ἐξαιρετὸν, or that which fell to his share as chief; of which the tenth was offered by Abraham. Thus δεκάτην ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων will mean δεκ. ἐκ (πάντων) τῶν ἀκροθινίων, i. e. all that he *possessed*. The word (as we learn from the Etym. Mag.) was originally used to denote the top of a heap of corn, from which a certain portion was taken as an ἀπαρχή.

5. καὶ οἱ μὲν—αὐτῶν. The Apostle now proves the superiority of Melchisedec to Abraham, by his paying tythe to him. For the Levitical Priesthood taking tythes of the people is an argument of their *superiority* to the people; as is therefore Melchisedec's taking tythe of Abraham of his superiority to the Patriarch, and consequently of Christ, the true High Priest, to all. (Thecphyl.)

Ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν. The Commentators supply the article, "*the* commandment." They might have compared Joh. 19, 7. νόμον ἔχομεν, &c. Ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαόν, *to tythe*, i. e. take or receive tythes. This sense of the word is rare (for elsewhere in the New Testament it signifies to *pay* tythes); but Heinr. adduces an example from 1 Sam. 8, 15. Heb. נָתַן. and Nehem. 10, 37. Κατὰ νόμον. So Joh. 19, 7., just cited. At the words τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν—Ἀβραάμ some modern Commentators stumble, as does also Rosenm. But there is no difficulty, if the

mode of interpretation of Theophyl., above cited, be adopted. And in the same way they are explained by the best recent Commentators.

6. ὁ δὲ—εὐλόγηκε. The Apostle here argues the superior dignity of Melchisedec to Abraham, from his having, though not of the priestly or Abrahamic race, taken tythes of him, and asked a blessing upon him, though he had *the promises*, namely, that in him should all the families of the earth be blessed. It is strange that none of the Commentators should have compared Gal. 3, 16. “to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.”

7. χωρὶς δὲ πάσης—εὐλογεῖται. The δὲ is *argumentative*, and may be rendered *now*. Χωρὶς πάσης ἀντιλογίας, “beyond all dispute.” Theophyl. explains ἀναντιρρήτως. In the τὸ ἔλαττον the Commentators remark the use of the neuter for the masculine; an idiom frequent in the Scriptural and Classical writers. But they do not notice that this may often be traced to some cause apart from elegance of diction. *Here*, considering how jealous the Jews were of the dignity of Abraham, we may well ascribe it to *delicacy*.

At εὐλογ. the Commentators stumble; as they do also at the *position*. But the difficulty is of their own making, and results from their unwarrantable lowering of the sense of εὐλογ. just before. Besides, the position is *popular*, and not to be pressed. It is to be understood of what is usually the case. So Theodoret explains: οἱ μείζους εὐλογεῖν τοὺς ἐλάττους εἰωθᾶσι. Theophyl. well adds: κρείττων ἄρα καὶ ὁ Μελχ. ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν προτυπῶν τοῦ πατριαρχου.

8. καὶ ὧδε μὲν—ῥῆ. It is well observed by Carpz. and Dind., that the ὧδε and ἐκεῖ are *not* (as some say) particles of *place*; but the former signifies *hic quidem*, and is opposed to ἐκεῖ δὲ, *illic autem*: a brevity by which a repetition of the whole sentence from ver. 5 and 6 is avoided. “Ὡδε, i. e. in the Levitical Law. So Theophyl.: ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. Ἀποθνήσκοντες, i. e. persons who die, and are therefore only life pos-

sessors. Ἐκεῖ δὲ, i. e. in the passage of Genesis, in the history of Melchisedec. (So Dind. and Rosenm.), or (as Theophyl. explains) ἐν τῷ πράγματι κατὰ τὸν Μελχ. The sense of ὅγῃ depends upon the interpretation, *supra ver. 3.*

9. καὶ, ὡς ἔπος—δεδεκάτωται. To preclude the objection that might possibly be started by the Priests of the Law, “And what is that to *us*, if Abraham paid tythes?” the Apostle says that, through the medium of Abraham, even *Levi* paid tythes, Levi the origin of the Priesthood, and who *received* tythes. Is not then Melchisedec greater than Levi, as, in a manner, receiving tythes of him, through the medium of Abraham? (Theophyl.) A somewhat bold argument, but very well suited to those whom the Apostle is addressing. For (to use the words of Jaspis) as the property of the parent is called the property of the children, so the Jews, whatever belonged to Abraham, considered as belonging to themselves, since for Abraham’s sake God had promised he would bless his seed.

It is strange that so many moderns should render the ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν *summam*, or, “to say the truth,” quite contrary to the perpetual use of this common phrase; and that, from a fear lest the usual sense should compromise the Apostle’s character. It is, however, not only most agreeable to the context, but is supported by the united authority of the most eminent antients and moderns. See Theophyl. and the sensible note of Mr. Slade.

10. ἔτι γὰρ—Μελχ. The phrase ἐν τῇ ὁσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡν signifies that Levi, and consequently the whole Sacerdotal tribe of Levi, were, though not ἐνεργεία, yet δυνάμει, in the loins of Abraham and their Fathers. (Rosenm.)

11. εἰ μὲν οὖν—λέγεσθαι;

The Apostle now proceeds to urge a *new* argument. (See the plan of the chapter.) Here the connection and course of reasoning is obscure; but of the accounts both of the antients and moderns, the following I conceive to be the best. First of Theophyl. (from Chrys.): “Ἐδειξεν, ὅτι ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ πολὺν βελτίων ἦν καὶ τοῦ

Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τοῦ Λευὶ, ἐν τάξει ἱερέως αὐτὸς γεγόμενος. Νῦν αὖθις ἕτερον ἐπιχείρημα εἰσάγει, δεικνὺς ὅτι ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἱερωσύνη πολλῶ ὑπερέχει τῆς τῶν Λευϊτῶν· καὶ ὅτι ἡ μὲν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τελεία, ἡ δὲ ἐκείνων ἀτελής· καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἦν τελεία ἡ νομικὴ ἱερωσύνη, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Λαρῶν ἔδει ἀναστῆναι ἱερέα· ὁ γὰρ Λαρὼν τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἦν φυλῆς· Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Λαρῶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, λέγεται ἀνίστασθαι ἱερεὺς· Λοιπὸν οὖν, ὡς ἀπελοῦς οὐσης ἐκείνης, ἀλλὰ ἀντεισάγεται. Dind. explains as follows: "The Apostle had evinced by a comparison between Melchisedec and the Levitical Priest, that these were far inferior to him, and so their priesthood was removed at a great distance from his. Since, however, it would not follow, (what he now proceeds to show,) that *another* priesthood was to be put in the place of the Levitical; (for perhaps both might stand together, one in heaven, where Christ is, the other on earth, by a constant Levitical succession;) he shows that by the Levitical Priesthood *that* was not effected which ought to have been effected, and therefore it was no longer of any use; and thus also the institutes and laws of the Mosaic religion, which were connected with that Priesthood, must likewise fall to the ground."

Εἰ μὲν—ἦν, literally, "if there had been any perfecting of what was proper by the Levitical priesthood," i. e. as Rosenm. explains, "if the Levitical Priesthood had done what it ought, namely, brought expiation, peace, holiness, and felicity, &c. And so Dind. in an able note. Other Commentators, however, take τελ. in another sense, to denote *expiation by sacrifices, or moral perfection, or complete happiness*: all liable to objection, and little agreeable to the context.

Of [the words τίς ἐτι χρεία—λέγεσθαι the simple sense (as Ern., Dind., and Rosenm. are agreed) is this: "what need was there that it should be abolished and another put in its place." For (as Rosenm. observes) the Apostle urges the words of the Psalm. κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχ., in order to evince that a *Levitical Priest* is not promised." With respect to ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα, it signifies to be *raised to the Priesthood*; as Exod. 1, 18. Acts 7, 18. For (as Grot. and Dind. observe) ἀνίστασθαι and ὤρ are used of those who are placed in offices of importance and dignity. Λέγεσθαι, *be called*, namely, in the Psalm. But we must not overlook the parenthetical clause ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο, where some difficulty and uncertainty exists, owing to the extreme brevity with which it is expressed. The words are thus explained by Theoph.: ὥρισθε ὥστε κεχρησθαι αὐτῇ, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἅπαντα πράττειν. In nearly the same manner Carpz. explains, whom see. The best of the later Commentators think that the ἐπὶ expresses *condition*, i. e. "on condition of being subject to." Perhaps the two significations may be united. The use of νομοθ. in the passive is rare: yet Wets. adduces an example from Demosth. c. Timarch.: τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ πλήθει νενομοθετημένα δεινὰ. It is rendered by Dind. *juberi ex lege, impelli ad aliquid vi legis*, to be legislated. The Commentators adduce examples from Philo. In the ἐτι there is an elegance; and it is found in a passage of Sext. Emp. cited by Wets.

12. μετατιθεμένης — γίνεται. The sense here is nearly the same as at ver. 11. “If the Levitical Priesthood be changed, there is a change of the religion itself. For the ceremonial is contained in the Levitical form of worship; so that without them the Mosaic Law could not even be understood. Therefore the priesthood falling, the Law must fall with it. (Dind.) Μετατίθεσθαι signifies simply to be changed; nor is there (as Krebs fancies) an allusion to playing at dice, or drafts. By μεταθ., Rosenm. observes, is meant a passing of the priesthood to one not a descendant of Aaron; which the Psalm predictions would be. Νόμου, sc. ἱερατικοῦ.

13. The Apostle now confirms the abrogation of the Priesthood by two arguments; 1. that Christ was descended not from the tribe of Levi, but of Judah, of which no one has hitherto held a sacred office. (Dind.) Ἐφ’ ὧν—τῷ θυσιασστηρίῳ, “Jam vero is, de quo illa (in Psalmo) dicuntur, aliâ de stirpe natus est, &c. Illud γὰρ eo pertinet, ut, præstructis, quæ oportebat jam ostendat, sensum Psalmi illius omnibus partibus in Jesum Nazarenum competere. (Rosenm., from Grot.) Ἐφ’ ὧν, “super quem,” “de quo.” So Theophyl.: περὶ οὗ. Μετέχειν signifies “to have any thing in common with another,” be a partaker with any, and a member of any body of men. Munthe compares Diodor. Sic. 127. μετ. τῆς παραλίου, “to be of the maritime district.” Προσέσχηκε τῷ Θεῷ, sub τὸν νοῦν, “has attended to, devoted himself to the care of.” The Greeks frequently say προσέχειν πελάγῳ, &c.; and Thucyd. 1, 15. προσεχ. τοῖς ναυτικοῖς. Others render, *appropinquare, operam dare alicui*. The various readings here have arisen from gloss, or misapprehension.

14. πρόδηλον—ἐλάλησε. It is rightly thought by Dind., that there is no difference between προδ. here and κατάδηλον at ver. 15. Yet the prepositions with which δῆλος is compounded have all, properly, an intensive force; and προδῆλος seems literally to sig-

nify the being plain *at first sight*. Ἀνατέταλκεν. This is supposed by Theophyl. to be an allusion to the prophecies concerning the *star* to arise from Jacob, even the Sun of righteousness. But the best moderns are agreed that the allusion is rather to the *springing up of plants*, (like the Hebrew צמח in Jer. 23, 5.) So in the Old Testament the Messiah is often called a צמח, or *plant*. And Carpz. compares a similar use of ἥρως and θάλος by the Classical writers, of heroes and illustrious persons. Εἰς ἥν. Like ἐφ' οὗ at ver 13. “Moses (explains Rosenm.) had said nothing about a Priest being chosen from the tribe of Judah. It follows, therefore, from the Psalm, that another law is to be substituted for the law of Moses.”

15, 16. καὶ περισσότερον—ἀκαταλύτον. The Apostle now urges also the words of the Psalm, in which it is said that the promised Priest would be a Priest *for ever*. (Rosenm.) The sense is: “And what I said (namely, that the Priesthood of Christ is far superior to that of Aaron, and that the law is to be changed,) is yet more plain, since such another Priest is promised like unto Melchisedec, who is not made such by the force of a human law, but that which reaches unto immortality.” The περισσότερον ἔτι καταδ. Commentators compare with a Rabbinical form of transition to another argument, ויותר בדר. Εἰ, *siquidem*, or rather *quod*, like the וכן; as Acts 26, 8., and sometimes in the Classical writers. See Schleus. Lex. Dindorf. renders it *quandoquidem* and *quoniam*. Ἀνίσταται, “there is to arise.” Ὅς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς. The κατὰ signifies *per, through, by the force of*. The σαρκικ. is taken by the best later Commentarors to mean *caducum, debile, quod hominibus mortalibus convenit*, failing and perishable, enduring only for a time. And they take νόμον ἐντολῆς for ἐντολ. itself, *lex quæ constat præscripto*. Perhaps, it may be rendered, by a law of fleshly command,” i. e. a law suitable only to mortals. Κατὰ δού-

ναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, "by the force of immortal life," i. e. that the Priest to be created is to be immortal. And such a power hath Christ.

Various, however, are the opinions in this verse, which may be seen in Pole, Carpz., Dindorf, and Braun.

17. Μαρτυρεῖ—Μελχισεδέκ. At μαρτυρεῖ some supply *David*; others (more properly) ἡ γραφή, i. e. the Holy Spirit, or God speaking by him. As to the var. lect. μαρτυρεῖται, it seems to be a mere paradiorthosis. Heinr. and Rosenm. observe, that the nervus probationis is in εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; for it was to be proved that Jesus is a priest κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, i. e. αἰώνιον.

18, 19. ἀθέτησις—τῷ Θεῷ.

Thus far he has shewn that a change of the law is to be made; now he subjoins a *reason* for this change of law. (Dind.) The sense is: "There is implied in these words an abolition and abrogation of the preceding law, because of its weakness and uselessness (for the purpose of real expiation.)" Ἀθέτησις signifies a setting aside, or abolition of a law by the same authority that instituted it. And ἀθέτησις γίνεται is for ἀθετεῖται. Theophyl. explains: ἐναλλαγή καὶ ἐκβολή. Τὸ ἀσθ. and τὸ ἀνωφελές, are adjectives neuter for substantives. The ἀσθενές, Dind. observes, answers to σαρκικόν. It signifies (as the Commentators explain) *weak*, as being insufficient to produce holiness and confer expiation. And Theophyl. well remarks, that it was so, as consisting wholly of precepts and prohibitions, without ministering any power for the performance of what was commanded, such as we have by the Holy Spirit." The ἀνωφελές (all Commentators are agreed) is to be taken *comparatè*. So Theophyl.: ὠφέλησε μὲν· ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι τελείους οὐκ ὠφέλησεν. The Apostle explains himself in the words following, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, where the Commentators, antient and modern, consider the neuter as put for the masculine; which yields a good sense; but perhaps there is also an allusion to the works themselves. See the note, *supra* ver. 7. The *reason*, Carpz. observes, is, that in the law there is no justification. See Rom. 7. and 8. For neither can the *moral* law make us holy, nor the ceremonial expiate our sins."

The clause following ἐπεισαγωγῇ—Θεῷ, is obscure, by being worded in a refined rather than a *popular* manner. The sense partly depends on the construction. A verb is left to be supplied. Most Commentators repeat ἐτελείωσεν ἡμᾶς; as if this clause were antithetical to the one which immediately preceded. But as the preceding is a parenthetical explanation of the ἀσθ. and ἀνωφ., it is not probable that the Apostle would extend the sentence to Θεῷ. And thus, too, something is left wanting to correspond to the

ἀθέτησις—ἐντολῆς. I therefore agree with many eminent moderns, that this clause is the antithesis to *that*; and γίνεταί is to be repeated ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. This too, is supported by some antients. So Schol. Matth.: ἐπεισάγεται δὲ ἡ τῶν κρειττόνων ἐλπίς. And Theophyl.: ἡθετήθη ἡ νομικὴ, ἐπεισίσχθη δὲ ἐλπίς, &c. Ἐπεισαγωγή signifies *introduction*. It is said to be a rare word. The Commentators have, however, adduced *one* example from Joseph. Ant. 11, 6, 3., to which I add Thucyd. 8, 92. I would also compare a similar expression in Eurip. Hel. 1037. εἰσφέρεις γάρ ἐλπίδας. By the ἐλπίδος is meant, not the *author of hope* (as Rosenm. explains), but the *hope of salvation* held forth in the Gospel, and introduced by Jesus, by which (the Apostle adds) we (alone) have approach to God, namely, with a hope of acceptance, through our great mediator Jesus. For such appears to be the force of ἐγγιζ., which the Socinians most unwarrantably pare down, and others as Braun, &c., extend too far. Theophyl. aptly adduces the preceding, εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος.

20—22. Here we have a *third* argument, directly proving the superiority of Christ's priesthood, from the oath, or solemn asseveration, that it would be perpetual. (Dindorf.) Now Christ being made priest by the interposition of an oath, is greater than the Aaronitish priests, who are made such *without* an oath. The very use of an oath implies something of high importance, and therefore shows the august dignity of Christ's priesthood. (Ern.) The words may be literally rendered: "And (there is this argument too, that) *inasmuch* as he was made a priest not without an oath, (for those have been made priests *without* an oath, but he *with* an oath, even that of him who said unto him, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent," &c.), in just so much, (so far, or thus,) is he made the mediator of a better covenant." In the οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, there is an elegant litotes: and γέγονε ἱερεὺς is to be supplied from ἱερεῖς γεγόνοτες, *within* the parenthesis; an irregularity indeed, but often found in Thucyd. and all writers who, from a superabundance of matter and an anxiety to bring out the sense in the fewest words, make long and involved sentences; of which, I would observe, Lord Clarendon is the most remarkable *modern* example.

Ὀρκωμοσία signifies literally *oath-swearing*. It is a rare word, though found in Ez. 17, 18 & 19. 3 Esdr.

8, 95. Schleus. compares the similar forms ἀπαμοσία, ἐπαμοσία, καταμοσία, συνωμοσία. The Classical writers use ὀρκωμόσιον, but in the tense *covenant*, or *treaty sanctioned by oath*, and sometimes the *sacrifice* which accompanied it. Γεγονότες is taken by the Commentators for γεγόνασι. But it may be a nominativus pendens.

22. ἔγγυος. This (Dind. observes) is used for the more Classical ἐγγυήτης and ἐξέγγυος; and signifies a *sponsor*, *vas*, *præs*, *fide jussor*, one who promises, engages, and answers for another, or is surety for him. Some recent Commentators render it *auctor*. But this is letting the significance of the term evaporate. It is by many rendered *mediator*, (and so Theophyl. μεσίτην); as, supra, 6, 17., Christ is said ὀρκῷ μεσιτεύειν. And such is the name assigned to him infr. 8, 6. 9, 15. Now the various senses of ἔγγυος have all a reference to the different *parts* of *Christ's work*, in being our mediator, and procuring our salvation, especially that of shedding his blood by dying, in order thus *inaugurare fœdus*, as Rosenm. expresses it. See more on this important subject in Carpz.

The force of διαθήκη has been before explained; and the superiority of the new to the old covenant is too obvious to need treating on. See the Commentators.

23, 24. καὶ οἱ μὲν—παραμένειν. Another point of superiority in Christ over the high priest of the law is now touched on, namely, that the Levitical high priesthood (for ἱερεῖς is put for ἀρχιερ.) was held only by a *succession* of different persons (above seventy, as we are told, up to the destruction of Jerusalem); since *those* were mortal; but in the new covenant there is only *one* Christ; because he is immortal. Ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, “he holds his priesthood in eternal continuity, without having to transmit it to a successor.” For that is the force of ἀπαράβατον (and so the Syr., Grot., and Braun.), since the office (as Dind. explains) has not to pass ex cessore ad successorem. Dind., moreover, remarks

that ἀπαραβ. is used by the Classical writers to denote *immutable*; which comes to the same thing. It is explained by Hesych. ἀσειστὸν; by Theophyl. ἀδιάκοπον, ἀδιάδοχον; by Œcumen. ἀτέλευτον (I conjecture ἀτελεύτητον); and by the Vulg. *sempiternum*. "Thus (observes Theophyl.) Christ is as superior as *immortality* is superior to *mortality*." It is well remarked by Rosenm.: "Sacerdotium ejus primum est in suo genere, et item ultimum. Hactenus autem æternus sacerdos dicitur Christus, quatenus nunc, postquam in cœlum abiit, nobis salutifer est. Hoc statim v. 25. aliis verbis repetitur."

25. ἦθεν—Θεῶ. This is, in some measure, exegetical of the preceding verse. On σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές Commentators differ in opinion. Some include *temporal* salvation; which may be admitted, but it was probably not here in the mind of the Apostle. Παντελῶς is explained by some antients and many eminent moderns as synonymous with εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, especially on account of the πάντως following. And so Chrys. and Theophyl. explain: "both in this world, and in the next." Others, as Braun and Elsner, contend that it must mean *omnino, prorsus*, i. e. *perfectim*, to the uttermost. And this yields a sense far more extensive and worthy of the Apostle; especially since (as Braun has suggested) there is an opposition between the Levitical priesthood and Christ. Perhaps, however, the above interpretations may be united.

The προσερχομένους is to be understood like the ἐγγίζομεν at ver. 19. And the ἐντυγχάνειν expresses the whole of the mediatorial office expressed in the ἔγγυος at ver. 22. On the expression ἐντυγχάνειν τινι it is observed by Morus ap. Rosenm.: "dicitur de eo qui præsens, absens, ullâ de causâ cum altero agit et tractat aliquid; et quot de causis, quot item modis cum altero agit, tot significationibus variatur vis hujus verbi, adeoque de deprecante, commendante, se alterius causâ interponente, accusante, defendente, paciscente dicitur."

26. τοιοῦτος γὰρ—γενόμενος, "Such an one as high

priest it was suitable and fitting should be given to us." On the *ἔπρεπεν* see Ernesti. "*Ὁσιος*, *pious*,* *holy*, *ἄκακος*, blameless of all evil. And from the general use of the word, there may be an allusion (as Theophyl. thinks) to his being devoid of guile and malice (as 1 Pet. 2, 22.), *ἀμικτὸς*, unstained with vice. And so of Christ it is said, "He did no sin." Of this term Classical examples are adduced by Wets. *Κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν*, i. e. not only far removed from any resemblance to sinners, but from any society with them. So Braun, Carpz., and Camer. *Ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος*. In the interpretation of this phrase some moderns, especially the *recent* Commentators, run into most wild speculations, which I shall not detail. On the other hand, Braun, by seeking in every one of these epithets a correspondence to the case of the Jewish high priests, entangles himself in interminable discussions. It seems better to imitate the prudence of the ancients, who recognise no more in the words than a phrase denoting exalted dignity and majesty at the right hand of God. (Compare Col. 8, 2. and Eph. 4, 10.) And so the most judicious of the modern Commentators. With respect to the comparison which Braun has drawn between those qualities of the *great* high priest and those which were required in the *Jewish* high priests, though I cannot but think the Apostle had a *general* allusion thereto, yet not (I conceive) to the extent which that learned and ingenious, but too fanciful, writer supposes. It is manifest that all this is spoken of the *human* nature of our Lord.

27. *ὁς οὐκ ἔχει—λαοῦ*. On the force of *καθ' ἡμέραν* the Commentators are much at issue. Lachmacher takes it of *the* day of *expiation* *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, with a subaudition of *τεταγμένην*. But this is too arbitrary an ellipsis to deserve notice. Others (as Rosenm.) interpret it *sæpenumero, quodocunque res postulat*.

* This, Ernesti observes, denotes both the holiness of his nature and his actual holiness as a man, in that he did no sin.

But this is unauthorized, and merely a device to avoid the difficulty. The phrase can only mean *every day* (for *ἐκάστην* must be supplied); as it is taken by the antients and the most eminent moderns. (See Limb., Braun, Wolf, Carpzov, and Mich.) It is supposed to have reference to the *daily* offering enjoined at Levit. 6, 20. (See Braun.) And Dind. observes that from Levit. 4, 3., Theodoret, and Maimonides, we learn that the High Priest *every day* offered up a sacrifice or *ἱεραγεῖν* for his own sins and those of the people. And Philo, 505., among the daily victims, reckons that *ἦν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους*. It is here observed by Rosenm.: “Facit ad nostram tranquillitatem, quod Pontifex noster non debuit pro se sacrificium offerre; nam ex eo discimus, eum omnia nostri caussâ et commodo nostro fecisse atque tulisse.”

27. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας, “For this (latter) he did once for all, when he offered *himself* up to death (as a sacrifice for the expiation of human sin), and therefore he had no occasion to repeat it (and as to the *former*, he needed it not, being free from all sin).” Such a clause *must* be supplied to complete the sense. That the *τοῦτο γὰρ*, &c. must be referred to what *immediately* precedes, is so plain that none but those who *wish* to deceive themselves can come to any other conclusion. The perversions of the Socinians here, and throughout the Epistle, are ably confuted by Braun. With respect to the *ἐφάπαξ*, *once for all* (as Rom. 6, 10.), it is opposed to the *καθ’ ἡμέραν*. Ἀναφέρειν and προσφέρειν are sacrificial terms.

28. ὁ νόμος γὰρ—τετελειωμένον. Here is subjoined the *reason* for the difference said to exist between the Levitical Priests and Christ, our High Priest. The sense is: “For the law maketh *men* High Priests, who (themselves) have weakness (i. e. frailty) and consequently sin (and therefore can, per se, offer no expiation); but the promise of oath (i. e. the sworn promise) which was subsequent to the law (appoints)

the Son, who is supremely perfected, and exalted for evermore." The λόγος τῆς ὀρκωμοσίας is illustrated by Ps. 110. The μετὰ τὸν νόμον, "after the promulgation of the law," is supposed to refer to the time of David. See also Dindorf. On the sense of τετελ. Commentators are not agreed. Carpz. and Rosenm. think there is a reference to the ἱερεῖον τελειωσέως, the victim of perfection and consecration mentioned by Philo, 676 A. Schleus. takes it to mean "raised to exaltation at the right hand of God." I prefer the sense assigned by Braun and Dind., *consummate, perfect*, and who can therefore, by his own merits, perfectly expiate. However, the interpretation of Carpzov. may be conjoined. Ernesti explains it, "immortal and exalted to the right hand of God." It is, however, not improbable that the term comprehends nearly *all* these and *other* senses assigned, as including a constellation of all the excellences that can be conceived, for the purpose above mentioned.

Theophyl. well points out the force of the antitheses thus: Ἐκεῖ νόμος, ἐνταῦθα λόγος ὀρκωμοσίας, τουτέστι, βεβαιότατος, ἀληθέστατος· ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωποι δούλοι πάντως· ἐνταῦθα υἱὸς, δεσπότης δηλαδή· ἐκεῖ ἀσθενεῖς, τουτέστι, προσπταίνοντες, ἁμαρτίαν ἔχοντες, θανάτῳ ὑπὸ κείμενοι· ἐνταῦθα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένος, τουτέστιν, αἰῶνιος, δυνατὸς, οὐ νῦν μόνον ἀναμάρτητος, ἀλλ' αἰεῖ.

CHAP. VIII.

This Chapter commences with two propositions: 1st, Christ is also High Priest in heaven. For in heaven is the true sanctuary; whereas the sanctuary on earth contains merely an adumbration of the celestial sanctuary; in heaven is the true tabernacle of God; whereas, in the temple and tabernacle on earth was only a shadow of the celestial tabernacle. 2dly, Since Christ is High Priest also in heaven, he must have some victim to offer up to God, and this victim is better than the Levitical ones. (Ernesti.)

It is now shown that Christ may be called High Priest, because he has really performed all the offices of a High Priest, and has discharged much more exalted sacerdotal offices, inasmuch as his own priesthood is far more excellent, and of infinitely greater dignity than Aaron's. For Christ is a Priest in *heaven*, not on *earth*. (Dind.)

1. κεφάλαιον δὲ, &c. On the sense of κεφάλαιον Commentators are not agreed. Most of the early ones render : "summa, vel elenchus est." Most of the later ones, "caput rei est." Either signification is supported by authority (see Wetstein's examples); but the *latter* seems the more agreeable to what follows : for (as Dind. observes) there is no recapitulation there to be found. It is, moreover, supported by the *antients*. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) : κεφάλαιον αἰὲν τὸ μέγιστον ἐστὶ. And then he states the sense thus : Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τουτέστιν, ἵνα εἴπω τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον, Θεὸν ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα. In some measure, however, the two significations merge into each other, and the former may relate to what precedes ; the latter to what follows.

On τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης I have before treated.

2. τῶν ἀγίων—ἄνθρωπος, "A minister of the sanctuary which *God* made (i. e. in heaven), and not man." On λειτουργός, which is rendered, by Ernesti, *antistes sacrorum publicus*, see the note on Rom. 13, 6. 15, 16. Phil. 2, 25. By the ἀγία is meant the sanctum sanctorum ; and, considering that the noun closely united with it (namely σκηνῆς) has affixed to it the epithet ἀληθινῆς (like ἄρτος ἀληθινός in Joh. 6, 32.), *true and worthy of the name*, it seems that that epithet may also be mentally extended to ἀγ., and both ἀγ. and σκ. be so called, as being *heavenly*, and therefore truly such, in opposition to the *earthly* ones, which were only *shadows* of the heavenly. Ἐπηξέν, *pitched*, i. e. made. The term is accommodated to the opposite, namely, the earthly tabernacle. On the nature of Christ's Priesthood see c. 7. On the subject of the accommodation of the sentiment

to Jewish opinions, the recent Commentators run into very wild speculations, and seem to have yet to learn ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ σωφρονεῖν.

3. πᾶς γὰρ—προσενέγκε. Dind. thinks this is an answer to the objection, that Christ had never in his life discharged the sacerdotal office. It is observed by Rosenm., that he here shows *why* he said λειτουργῶς; namely, because such is every High Priest. It is therefore *necessary* that Christ, whom the Psalm calls a *Priest*, and one, indeed, far more excellent than the Mosaic ones, should have somewhat to *offer*. *What* that this he tells us at 9, 2.; namely *himself*, by whom we attain remission of sins, and eternal salvation.

4, 5. εἰ μὲν γὰρ—ἐπουρανίων. The Apostle here *evolves* the notion of High Priest and λειτουργῶς ἐπουράνιος, brought forward at v. 3. At ver. 4. *one* of these, namely the ἐπουρ., is explained *ab indirecto*. After the words εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν must be supplied ἱερεύς, which is to be taken for ἀρχιερ. (Carpzov.) The force of the argument, which is deduced *ex absurdo*, is this: "If I were to say that Christ is a Priest on *earth*, I should not call him a *Priest* at all; since such there are on earth to offer sacrifices; but these are nothing compared to the celestial Pontiff; since their offices are but a faint adumbration of his true priesthood in Heaven. (Dind.) "Οντων τῶν ἱερέων, "since there *are already* priests there." Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκία λατρεύουσι, "who (however) perform the ministry," &c. In ὑποδείγματι and σκία the latter is exegetical of the former, and properly signifies a *faint sketch*, or outline, traced for a painter, or a model for an architect, who fills up the body or ὑπόστασις of the figure, and complete the work. The propriety and force of the term is obvious. But it is strange the Commentators should not have seen that these Datives are put for the Accusative with εἰς. Τῶν ἐπουρανίων, scil. μερῶν, i. e. heaven itself, as Eph. 1, 20. Καθὼς κεχηρμάτισται—ᾧρει. The sense is: "As Moses, when about to set up the tabernacle,

was directed by God, See that thou make it after the model shown to thee in the mount." On χρηματίζεσθαι, *to be Divinely directed*, I have before treated. The phraseology here is well illustrated from the Rabbins, and Philo, by Braun and Carpzov. The general sense is thus laid down by Rosenm.: "Omnia, quæ in templo tanquam in umbra repræsentantur, ea in cœlo sunt revera. In illo tabernaculo sanctum sanctorum repræsentat thronum Dei; sed cœlum revera sedes Dei est," &c.

6. νυνὶ δὲ—νενομοθέτῃται. The νυνὶ, Grot. observes, is not indicative of *time*, but *opposition*, i. e. "according as things now are." So Theophyl.: νυνὶ δὲ μὴ ὦν ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔχων, &c. Διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε λειτουργίας, "he hath obtained, and possesses, a more excellent ministry." At διαφ. must be understood τοσούτω, to correspond to the ὅσῳ just after. The κρείττοιος διαθήκης μεσίτης is the same with the ἔγγυος κρ. διαθ. at 7, 22., where see the note. The *Attic* term was μεσέγγυος, which Hesych. explains μεσίτης. On these terms, and the nature of the superiority of the New Covenant see Braun and Carpzov. Ἦτις νενομοθέτῃται, literally, *legislated*, as having been established and founded on better promises. Rosenm. observes that νενομ. was used rather than τίθηται, to show that this was at once a *covenant* and a *law*. Compare 7, 11. In ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις the ἐπὶ denotes *condition*; and, indeed, this preposition is often used in speaking of *contracts*. The sense therefore will be: *sub promissis præstantioribus*, "so as to contain better promises."

7. εἰ γὰρ—τόπος. The argument at 7, 22. is here pursued, and, from the introduction of a *New Covenant*, it is inferred that the former was insufficient: a thing which God himself had foreseen, and therefore spoke of that new covenant to the first Israelites. (Dind.) Ἀμεμπτος, *irreproachable, perfect*, i. e. able to accomplish all the purposes of such a διαθ., and to make men ἀμεμπτοι, to reform, save, and bless them. See Braun, Limb., and Carpzov. With respect to the words οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος, it is

strange the Commentators should not have seen that two sentences are blended into one, i. e. "a second could not have been sought for," and, "there would have been no place for a second." It is well observed, by Heinr., that ζητεῖν τόπον is the Latin *circumspicere*.

On the imperfection of the Law see Whitby.

8—12. μεμφόμενος—διαθήκην καινήν.

That the old Covenant was not perfect, not ἄμεμπτον, is now proved from a passage of Jeremiah. (Dind.) The μεμφόμενος is, by most recent Commentators, referred to διαθήκη. But, as Heinr. and Dind. rightly observe, that would have required αὐτῇ to have been expressed. The antients and early moderns, and, of the recent Commentators, Heinr. and Dindorf, maintain that it must be referred to αὐτοῖς (of which syntax Raphel and Wets. adduce many examples); and this is required by the words following.

The passage is from Jer. 31, 31—34.; and agrees with the Sept., excepting a few minute discrepancies, supposed to have arisen from citing by memory; but perhaps also attributable to some variation between the Sept. Version then and at the present time. See Surenh. βιβ. κατ. 625., and Mr. Horne's Introd. in loc. Ἡμέραι ἔρχονται. Present for Future, say the Commentators. But it may be rendered, "are coming." Καὶ, when (like the Heb. ו), or more simply, and (then). Συντελέσω, peragam, I will accomplish, form. So Jer. 34, 15. συνετέλεσαν διαθήκην. See Schleus. Lex. Ἐπὶ, super, erga, Heb. חַס, with. Οἶκον, people. Ἰούδα and Ἰσραὴλ Dindorf and Heinr. take to denote all the Israelites of the twelve tribes; for Israel did not then exist as a separate kingdom; though it was probably spoken of separately. And so Pierce, and most of the later moderns. Yet see Braun and Mackn. Upon the general sense of the passage see Pierce, Mich., and Rosenm.

Κατὰ, like unto, כַּ. Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, "at the time." Ἐν—αὐτοῖς, literally, "in the day of my taking them by the hand (in order) to lead them from." The expression ἐπιλ. χειρὸς is a figure derived from the simplicity of antient phraseology. At ἐξαγαγεῖν must be understood εἰς τὸ ὃν ἔνεκα. "Ὅτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν, &c. The ὅτι Mackn. renders when. But the real sense is that of the common version, because: for (as Dindorf observes) there now follows the reason why a new covenant was to be formed, namely, because the old one was not observed. Ἐμμένειν ἐν denotes "to continue in, and constantly and habitually observe and do any thing." It is often used of covenants. The full sense is: "they did not continue in the performance of the precepts enjoined in the covenant, and covenanted to be performed." Hence, as Rosenm. observes, διαθήκη sometimes denotes the whole religion. It is then added ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, "I neglected them," as Mackn. renders. Preferable, however, is the common version, "I regarded them not," or Doddridge's, "I disregarded them." And the Commentators might

have compared 1 Sam. 2, 30., "them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed," where the Sept. has ἀτιμασθήσονται. There is here an *apparent* discrepancy between the ἡμέλησα of St. Paul and the Sept., and the יָלַעַב of the Heb., rendered in our English version (conformably to good authorities), "I was a husband to them." But that sense would be very harsh; and the more profound researches of the great Orientalists of the last two centuries (who, by uniting a study of the Syriac and Arabic, and the other sister dialects, with that of the Hebrew, have thrown so much light on very many obscure passages) here come to our aid, and inform us that לַעַב, from the use of the Arabic, may mean *fastidire, aversari*. And they add, that such is the interpretation adopted by the greatest Jewish Expositors, who, besides a knowledge of Hebrew, were perfectly versed in the Arabic. See the notes of Mich. and Dind. Thus all is plain, and the above passage of 1 Sam. much confirms the interpretation.

10. ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη. The ὅτι, ἦ, is by Heinr. rendered *sed*; by Carpzov and Rosenm., *scilicet*; which is preferable: but no great stress is to be laid on the particle. Διδούς (as Ernesti observes) is, after the Hebrew, put for the Indicative δώσω. But the Sept. have here expressed a Hebraism which is not found in our present text, namely יָתַן for נָתַן. The ἐπιγράψω is very significant: q. d. "I will cause that they shall understand and keep in mind my precepts." A metaphor of which Carpzov cites an example from Philo 17 D. ἄνθρωποι γραψάμενοι ταῖς ἐαυτῶν ψυχαῖς. And Dind. one from Joseph. c. Ap. 2, 18., where he says that the Jews have Moses's νόμους ἐγκεχαράγμένους ταῖς ψυχαῖς. I add Æschyl. Choeph. 447. τοιαύτ' ἀκούων ἐν φρεσὶ γράφου. See Rosenm. The words ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς—λαόν are rightly considered by Carpzov as a *formula solennis*, which might be added in forming any Divine covenant, and which comprehends all the effects of Divine grace. The words denote protection and benefits on the one hand, and obedience and worship on the other.

11. καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν—αὐτοῦ. The οὐ μὴ διδάξ. is taken by the best Commentators in the sense, "they will have no need to teach." Some MSS. read (from the Heb.) διδάξουσιν, "they will not teach." The sense is (as Doddr. observes): "they will not teach, because there will be no need for it." For τὸν πλῆ-

σιον Griesb. edits, from several MSS., τὸν πολίτην. And so the Sept. And certainly this is more agreeable to the Scriptural style. Γνωθὶ τὸν Κύριον is explained by Dind., “embrace the worship of the true God, as contained in the religion of Moses.” But it seems rather to refer to what is enjoined on the Israelites, Deut. 6, 7., to converse on the truths of their religion in the course of their “walking by the way,” doubtless for the purpose of instructing the ignorant. Now for *this*, it is predicted, there will be, *comparatively*, no need under the new and better covenant. By the πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ are denoted *all, of every age*. A proverbial phrase, signifying *all, without exception*.

12. ὅτι ἴλεως ἔσομαι—ἔτι. In these words, (Dind. observes) the *other* promise, “I will be their God,” is explained; q. d. “I will be merciful to their offences, and I will no longer remember the sins of this people.” Ἰλεως, mild, clement, easy to be entreated, ready to forgive. Ταῖς ἀδικίαις, i. e. to the *persons* guilty of, &c. The terms ἁμαρτ. and ἄνομ. are nearly synonymous. It is observed by Ernesti, that the latter signifies transgression against the law, and the former, *any* transgression. See Ps. 32, 1. *Not to remember sins* is a refined way of expressing *forgiveness* of them.

13. ἐν τῷ λέγειν—ἀφανισμοῦ. From this prophecy the Apostle proceeds to prove the abolition of the old Covenant, and that by a popular argument and illustration. (Dind.) The words may be rendered thus: “By making mention of a new Covenant, he represents the former as antiquated. Now what is antiquated and grown old, weak, and useless, is near to its end, and ready to be done away.” Such is the general sense. With respect to the phraseology, πρώτην is for προτέραν; so also τελειοῦσθαι (as Ern. remarks) is properly applicable to *things*; and γηράσκειν, to *persons*: but the terms are often interchanged in figurative diction. On the exact nature of the metaphor in ἀφανισμοῦ the Commentators differ (see Kypke, Braun, and Carpz.), and come to

no certain determination. One thing is clear, that the expression obscurely alludes to that destruction of the Temple and the Jewish worship which took place about ten years after. On the nature of the various changes of the old Covenant see the learned annotations of Braun.

CHAP. IX.

After the foregoing comparison between the sacerdotal office of Aaron and Christ, it will now, according to the primary purpose of the Epistle (which see in the Argument) be shown that all that splendour and magnificence of the Jewish λειτουργία, which so dazzled, nay blinded the eyes of the Jews, and which therefore they were so unwilling to lay aside, is, in the new religion, far more august. From different parts of Exod. 25—27. Paul shows that the whole Jewish worship was indeed splendid, but only respected what is external, and was to be repeated again and again. By the Divine counsel, then, it was only to last for a time, till the *perfect* one was to be introduced; which was done by Jesus Christ. (Jaspis.)

VER. 1. εἶχε—κοσμικόν. It is observed by Dodd., that our Translators strangely supply the word *covenant* instead of *tabernacle*, whereas most copies read σκηνή, *tabernacle*, and that undoubtedly suits the connection best. But, with his good leave, our Translators are right, and he is wrong. They did well in supplying *covenant*, which the context requires: and they *justly* considered σκηνή as having no place; for it is not found in many antient MSS., nearly all the Versions, and many Fathers and Greek Commentators: and such has been the opinion of almost every Critic for the last two centuries. I suspect that Dodd. was misled by Whitby and Wolf, who here warmly defend the σκηνή, but whose judgment, in *Critical* matters, was but moderate. The

best Interpreters, from Chrys. to Dindorf, unite in supplying διαθήκη from the preceding. See Chrys. and Phot. ap. Œcumen.

1. δικαιώματα λατρείας, the ritual precepts and constitutions pertaining to the public worship of God; whatever God ἐδικαίωσεν, was pleased to appoint. So Theophyl.: θεσμούς καὶ νομοθεσίας. Some, as Grot., Drus, Camer., Hamm., and Carpz., take λατρείας for an accusative plural. But this is not so agreeable to the context. The antient and the best recent Commentators are agreed that λατρ. is the genitive singular, i. e. "the several ordinances of worship." Ἁγίον κοσμικόν, *worldly* sanctuary, as opposed to the *celestial* one, or heaven, which is the seat of God. Other explanations of κοσμ. are to be found in the Classical writers; but this seems the most natural. The Apostle (Carpz. observes.) here adverts to that first tabernacle of Moses which Philo 665. calls the ἱερὸν φορητὸν (Sept. σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου), afterwards preserved in the treasury of the temple.

2. σκηνὴ γὰρ—ἁγία. These words have more perplexed the Commentators than they will confess; and have been most strangely rendered by some Translators. (See the E. V.) The antient and best moderns, however, are agreed that πρώτη has reference to *place*, not *time*. See Dindorf, and also Rosenm., who remarks that the σκηνή was the name often given to the whole tabernacle or tent, of which there were two parts, but which were also themselves rightly termed σκηναὶ, as having each of them their veil or curtain. Therefore (he adds) the σκηνή πρώτη is the προτέρα or interior part, to which in the Temple that place corresponds, which Philo calls the πρόναος, היכל. The *second*, on account of its greater holiness, was termed the Sanctum Sanctorum, to which, in the Temple, that part corresponded which was called the דביר, literally oracle-place. See Philo 665 c. and 668 c.

2. ἐν ᾗ ἢ τε λυχνία, *the candlestick*. See Ex. 25, 31—39. 33, 17—24. and the note of Carpz. Τράπεζα—

ἄρτων. This is rendered by the best Interpreters, the table, and the twelve loaves exposed upon it; ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων being (they say) for οἱ προτίθεντες ἄρτοι. See Exod. 25, 30. Or, as Braun thinks, there is an hypallage for ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως; as Matt. 12, 11. They are so called (Rosemn. observes), as being always in sight of the Priests. Yet it is more natural to suppose them so called, as being placed before the Lord. And so (I find) Braun, whom see.

3. μετὰ—ἅγια ἁγίων, “After or beyond the second veil was the Holy of Holies.” The Commentators observe that the name καταπέτασμα signified properly the veil spread opposite the Sanctum Sanctorum; and κάλυμα, that turned towards the temple. See more in Carpz., Dind., and especially Braun. Such matters of antiquarian research I must decline; and indeed they seem more fitted to treatises on Jewish Antiquities. The reader is referred throughout this passage to Mr. Horne’s Introduction, and also to the authorities adduced by him.

4. Χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον. The θυμιατ. some render, “the altar of incense.” It is, however, objected by others, that that cannot here be meant; since, as we find from Ex. 30, 1., Philo, Joseph, and the Rabbins, it stood in the outer tabernacle. They therefore understand, the golden censer (i. e. *incenser*), which, they say, was used by the High Priest every year, on the day of expiation. And they refer to Levit. 16, 12. So also Deyling Obs. P. 2. p. 578., Altling, Ern. in loc., and Fisher. But this interpretation is by Rosenm. thought harsh: and he, in common with some others, as Mich., Heinr., and Dind., conjectures that the true reading is ἱλαστήριον. The reader will do well to consult the copious annotation of Dind., who, however, acknowledges that this is a turbidus locus, quem non faciliè quis ad liquidum perducatur. And indeed the obscurity of the passage, together with our imperfect information on the subject, may prevent it from ever being tho-

roughly understood; but *ignorance* is surely to be preferred to the fancied light of conjecture.

4. περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ. This corresponds to what we find in Philo 668 c. ἐνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν κεκρυσσωμένη πολυτελῶς, “richly gilded, inside and outside.” See also 1050. And so Joseph. Ant. 8, 6, 5. χρυσῷ δὲ τὰ τε ἔντος καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν περιεπλήλατο πάντα, ὡς ἀποκέκρυφθα τὴν ξύλωσιν. See Braun and Carpz. It is evident that it was covered with thin gold plates: a very antient custom, and of which vestiges are found in the temples of Mexico, Peru, and elsewhere in America.

Ἐν ᾧ, i. e. not σκίνη, as most Commentators supply, but κιβώτω. And so some antients and most recent Commentators. And this seems most suitable to the context. Difficulties, however, are by some raised, and by others solved; on which, see Dind. On στάμνος see Schleus. Lex. and Exod. 16, 32. Καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν—διαθήκης. This is not at variance with 1 Kings 8, 9. and 2 Chron. 5, 16. where the tables of the above are said to have been there. In the time of Moses (it seems) *all three* were there; but at the time of Solomon, only the tables. Buxtorf, indeed, Hist. Arc. 7, 72. adduces Jewish authorities which may induce us to suppose that there were capsules or representations about the ark, for the convenience of keeping some of the sacred ornaments; and it is thought by some that the pot and the rod were placed in these ledges of the ark; and that when the ark was transported from place to place, they were removed. This is not improbable; though all is mere conjecture.

On the rest of the verse see Num. 17, 13. and Exod. 25, 16. 40, 20. and Braun, Dind., and Mackn.

5. Ὑπεράνω—ἰλαστήριον, “the cherubims glorious and resplendent with burnished gold.” (See Exod. 25, 22. and Levit. 16, 2.) So Rosenm. explains. But considering what we are told in Ps. 80, 1. of the glory of the Lord dwelling between the cherubims,

it cannot but be supposed there is a reference thereto; especially as the cherubims were symbols of the Divine presence. See Whitby, and compare his references. On the persuasion among all nations of some *particular place* being selected by the Deity for the manifestation of his presence by a visible glory, see Mackn. and Parkh. Hebr. Lex. v. כַּרְב, and a plate in loco, illustrative of the cherubims. Compare also Ez. 1, 5—10. 10, 14. 41, 18 and 19. Now these signified the supreme governance of God over all created things, and his tutelary presence. See Ex. 25, 22. &c.

5. ἱλαστήριον, *cover*, or *lid*, from כִּפֵּה, whence our verb *to cover*. Now this consisted of a sheet of pure gold, which covered the ark of the covenant, and was so called, because, on the solemn annual day of expiation, it served to receive the blood of the bullock sprinkled by the Hight Priest. See Rom. 3, 25. and the note.

5. περὶ ὧν. Dind. supplies δικαιωμάτων λατρείας, mentioned at ver. 1. But perhaps we may understand both the *sacred things above* enumerated, and the *services* connected with them, or otherwise enjoined by the Levitical Law. On the ark, tables of the covenant, and cherubims, see Braun in loc. and in his Select Sacr. p. 2. Κατὰ μέρος, “in every part, and according to all their allusions and symbols. It is observed by Theophyl.: Ἐμφαίνει ἐνταυθα, ὅτι οὐ ταῦτα ἢ μόνα τὰ ὀρώμενα, ἀλλ’ αἰνίγματά τινα ἦν, ἃ τὸ θεωρεῖν καὶ ἐξηγεῖσθαι μακροτέρου δεῖται χρόνου.

6. τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατεσκευασμένων, “Quum ita se habeat tentorii exterioris et interioris structura.” Διὰ παντός, scil. χρόνου, *perpetually*, at all the regular times of sacrifice, or daily, morning and evening. The πρώτην σκηνήν is to be taken as supra, ver. 2. Ἐπιτελοῦντες is, as some say, for ποιοῦντες. But it is a stronger term, and adapted to the λατρείας, which signifies, as at ver. 1., *divine worship*.

7. εἰς δὲ—χωρὶς αἵματος. By the δεύτεραν, or ἑσω-

τέραν, is meant the *adytum*. Ἀπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, “once in the year,* בשנה, the 10th of Tisri. See Ex. 30, 10. Levit. 16, 34. Πρῶσφ. is a sacrificial term, which has been before treated on. Now these offerings were made first for himself and his own ἀγνοήματα (as we are told) with the *calf's* blood; and then, for those of the people, with the *goat's*. By the ἀγνοήματα are meant properly the sins of ignorance, or those proceeding from human inadvertence and infirmity, and not from deliberation. And so some Commentators here explain, who include both offences against the moral, and against the ceremonial law. But the best modern Interpreters are agreed that the word is here used by euphemism (with reference perhaps to the term which would be used by the High Priest in his prayer on the occasion), for *sins* in general, i. e. all but those of presumption, or of a deep dye, and such as the law punished, or with respect to which it, at least, allowed no expiation, or sacrifice, to avail; the *sins, negligences, and ignorances*, of our Liturgy includes *both*. See Grot., Wolf, Munthe, Loesn., and others, who testify that this sense of the term, and of its cognate ones ἀγνοία and others, is found not only

* By this, some say, we are not to understand, *only once in the year*, but, *in one day only*. For on that day, the Rabbins tell us, he entered and departed *four* times, to bring in singly the batillers, the incense, the blood of the calf, and of the goat. To this, however, Ernesti opposes the authority of Levit. 16, 2 and 12., by which it appears that he went *twice*. And a passage of Philo, 1035. is adduced, where it seems he asserted that he only went in *once* on that day. But that has been proved not to have come from Philo. After all, the whole is involved in uncertainty; and possibly the custom varied at different times. Yet we can hardly suppose that the High Priest could carry with him *at once* all that was necessary for the solemnity of the day.

As to his *going alone*, on that point all are agreed. See Cunæus. It may be observed, that the *Heathens* carried this custom still further; sometimes not allowing even the *Priest* to enter the *adytum* except with his head shrouded. So Pausan. ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑκτῷ ὁ Σωσίπολις ἔχει τιμὰς, καὶ ἐς αὐτὸ εἴσοδος οὐκ ἔστι πλὴν τῇ θεραπείᾳ οὐσῇ τὸν θεόν, ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐφειλκυμένῃ ὕφους λευκῶν.

in the Sept. Version, but the Classical writers.* See also the excellent notes of Whitby, Hamm., Le Clerc, and Slade.

8. τοῦτο δηλοῦντος—στάσιν. Recitatis cultus Levitici ceremoniis Apostolus docet, quid eo significatum fuerit, et quo modo. Constat enim omnia hæc symbolicè aliud quid innuisse. (Dind.) The sense is: "The Holy Spirit (by) thus signifying to us that the way to the Holy of Holies was, while the tabernacle had a standing, not yet laid open." Δηλοῦντος, *signifying, declaring*. And so Philo frequently, as cited by the Philologists. Τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου, namely, by Moses. Μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι, "not distinctly revealed. Τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν. By the way being revealed is meant the true and efficacious approach to God, and the mode of attaining the real ἅγια ἁγίων, namely, heaven itself. The τῶν ἁγίων, Theophyl., Grot., and other Commentators observe, is for εἰς τὰ ἅγια. But of this they adduce no example. The following therefore may be acceptable. Matt. 10, 5. εἰς ὁδὸν ἔθνων μὲ ἀπέλθῃτε. By the ἡ πρώτη σκῆνη is meant the first tabernacle in which the Levitical worship was performed. Ἐχούσης στάσιν. An elegant expression, signifying sometimes no more than *standing*, of which the Philologists adduce several examples; but here (as Dind. rightly observes,) it has the sense of *vigere, valere, permanere*. And so Theophyl. explains: ἕως οὐ κρατεῖ ὁ νόμος, καὶ αἱ κατ' αὐτὸ λατρεῖαι τελοῦνται.

9. ἥτις (i. e. σκῆνη πρώτη) παραβολὴ (ἐστίν) εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεσθηκότα. The παραβολὴ is well explained by Chrys. and Theophyl. τύπος καὶ σκιαγραφία. By Hesych. πραγμάτων ὁμοίωσις. It is opposed to the τελείωσις of the New Testament. See Œcumen. Philo calls it ἀλληγορία. See Carpz. and Dind. The καιρὸν ἐνεσθηκότα Rosenm. and Dind. explain as a

* Of this I have noted numerous examples in my reading, of which I will here adduce a single passage from Thucyd. 6, 89. ἀλλὰ περὶ ὁμολογουμένης ἀγνοίας οὐδὲν ἂν καιρὸν λέγοιτο.

participle preterite for the present, denoting the time when the Epistle was writing. For the temple worship continued till the destruction of the temple by Titus, when the *signs* ceasing, the *thing signified* must succeed to their place.

9. καθ' ὃν δῶρά—λατρεύοντα, “up to which time,” &c.; (καιρὸν being understood). Μὴ δυνάμεναι τελειῶσι τὸν λατρεύοντα, “but which cannot procure the expiation or remission of sins to the worshipper.” So 7, 19. οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, and 10, 1. where is read in some MSS., by a gloss, καθάρισαι, and ver. 14. where Œcumen. explains ἀπήλλαξε τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. By τὸν λατρεύοντα is meant, not the Priest, but the person in whose name the sin offering was made. The κατὰ συνείδησιν is explained by Theophyl. κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. By Rosenm., *the mind and conscience*, i. e. (he adds) so that no suspicion should rest on the mind that any sin would be unexpiated. “Now the Hebrews (continues he) well understood that the *labes animi* could not be expiated by the Levitical ceremonies; and that God does not delight in gifts and offerings, but in a pure mind. See Philo. 159 B.” This, however, is too fanciful; and is ascribing to the many the sentiments of the enlightened few. There is far more solidity in the exposition of Braun and Carpz., which see.

10. μόνον—ἐπικείμενα. Now follows the reason why he had denied the efficacy of oblations and sacrifices to procure reformation or expiation; namely, because they consist only in *externals*. (Dind.) The sense is: “and which are so constituted as to endure, and consist, only until the time of reformation, as being placed only in meats,” &c. The ἐπικείμενα is referred to δῶρα: and as δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι preceded, Heinr. thinks it an anacoluthon. But in such a case the *neuter* is purposely adopted; πράγματα being understood; so that the ἐπικείμενα is a nominativus pendens.” Ἐπικεῖσθαι, Dind. observes, is used of *laws*; and signifies *valere*.” Or rather, *to be laid upon, enjoined, and made binding*.

And so it is used sometimes by Thucyd. The ἐπὶ is rendered by Schlit. and Rosenm. *præter*. But Braun and Dind. rightly explain it *in*, ἐν. So the Syr. ܒ. See Hardy, *supra*. With the βράμασι and πόμασι the Commentators are somewhat perplexed. They are commonly explained by the *meats* and *drinks* forbidden to the Nazaræi. But to this it is objected by Mich., that the passage does not treat of meats by which any one is *polluted*, but by which he is *sanctified*. Thus he, in conjunction with Rosenm., refers the words to the eating of meats which were holy, and a partaking of which was supposed to have a sanctifying influence. See Hos. 8, 15. and Hebr. 13, 9—11. Thus the βρωμ. will denote the *shew-bread* and other oblation food, permitted to the priest, but forbidden to the people; and the πόματα, the libations of wine, &c. to be poured out on the altar; which formed a part of the sacerdotal office. See Braun in loc.

Δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς. These are explained by Dind., from Carpz. and others, the laws and precepts which pertained to the *body* and *external* things (as of the distinction of meats and drinks, of ablutions, of certain days), and which therefore could not constitute innocence, and integrity of mind and conscience; though (as Rosenm. adds) they liberated the person from punishment, and admitted him to the society of other men.

The καιρὸς διορθώσεως is explained by the best Commentators, “the period which should introduce a reformation of religion by the change of external and corporeal into internal and mental worship.” I cannot but suspect that the expression was used with allusion to a common mode of speaking among the Jews respecting the period of the advent of the Messiah, at which they expected *these* blessings, of moral and religious reformation, as well as political deliverance, and temporal felicity. On which see Whitby.

11, 12. Χριστὸς δὲ—ἀγαθῶν. Jam his tanquam in protasi præmissis sequitur in hac apodosi palmarium

argumentum, quâ Christum meliorem cultum, splendidiora et efficaciora sacra induxisse evincit. (Dind.) It is now shown that by Christ, the author of a more perfect religion, are produced all those effects which by the high priests of the New Testament, and by the Levitical worship, could not be brought about; that by him was laid open the way to true and spiritual reformation, peace, and eternal felicity.

Μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, i. e. (as the best Commentators are agreed) spiritual, celestial, and eternal blessings, such as we expect to enjoy perfectly in a *future* state only, though commenced in this. Besides, as Braun observes, they were future as long as Christ was future, and as long as the Tabernacle and its worship stood. The nature of them is well stated by Carpz. and Braun, whom see. With ver. 12—15. the Commentators might have compared 2 Cor. 4, 18., where see the note.

11. διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς. On the sense of σκηνῆς the Commentators are not agreed. Many early moderns, as Cajet. and Menoch., and of the recent ones Braun, take it to mean the church of the New Testament, i. e. the whole earth. (See Braun.) The antients, and many moderns, as Pisc., Beza, Junius, Zeg., Capell., Grot, Hamm., and Pierce explain it, the body, or human nature of Christ; which they support from the verse following, “by his own blood.” And indeed that was a name often given to the body; as Joh. 2, 21., where Christ’s body is called a *temple*. Grot. observes, that the Apostle, intending to say that Christ had entered into the highest heaven, by sufferings and death, in order that he might pursue the commenced comparison with the priest of the law, chose to say, that he entered *through his body and through his blood*: for the body may, by metonymy, be put for the *pains* of the body; and *blood* for *death* is frequent.” Yet this interpretation is somewhat harsh; and many objections are made to it by Carpz. The more recent Commentators, from Wets. downwards,

are of opinion that the Apostle continues the similitude commenced; and they take the σκῆνην to mean *cœlum aërium et æthereum*. Thus the *cœlum aspectabile*, they say, was sometimes called by the Jews *the tent of God*: and they refer to 8, 2. & 4, 14. They then assign the following sense: "As the high priest of the Old Testament passed through the first tabernacle, and went to the adytum, so did Christ, after death and resurrection, pass through the air to the highest heaven, and sit at the right hand of God." I confess I am at a loss to say which of these two interpretations I prefer. It may be prudent, with Grot., to unite *both*, "Notandum (says he), sæpe eandem rem V. Testamenti ad plures significatus referri; ut Tentorium exterius ad significandum *cœlum astriferam ejusque effectus*; ad significandum *totum cultum legalem*; ad significandum *corpus Christi, propter diversa Tentorii illius accidentia, quæ commodè et huc et illuc referri poterant.*"

The expression χειροποίητος, denotes (as Carpz. explains) works made by *human* hands, in opposition as well to those which seem to exist *suâ sponte*, as to those which are celestial and divine: both of which senses are illustrated by Elsner., to whose examples I add an especially apposite one from Thucyd. 2, 27. ἐγένετο φλόξ τοσαύτη, ὅσῃν οὐδεὶς πω ἔς γε ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον χειροποίητον εἶδεν. ἤδη γὰρ ἐν ὄρεσιν ὕλη τριφθεῖσα ὑπ' ἀνέμων πρὸς αὐτὴν, ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου πῦρ καὶ φλόγα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνῆκε· where I shall have occasion to adduce other examples.

11. οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. Beza well renders this: "non hujus structuræ," not built by *human* hands, as was the Levitical tabernacle.

12. οὐδὲ δι' αἱματος—εὐράμενος, "Neither by the blood of (victims such as) bulls and goats, but with his own blood he entered once for all into the holy of holies, having obtained eternal redemption for us by his blood." It is observed by Rosenm. that διὰ denotes the necessary *condition* by which Jesus, our

high priest, passed through the sanctuary to the adytum. For that is said to be done *by* any thing, which is not done *without* it. So the Jewish high priests did not enter the adytum without the blood of bulls and goats.” Διὰ τοῦ αἵματος, by (the pouring out of) his own blood, by which the expiation of men was consummated; as by the entering of the high priest into the adytum, and the sprinkling the blood on the ἱλαστήριον the solemn act of expiation was accomplished.” Ἐφάπαξ, *once for all*. This is meant to signify that that *one* entering sufficed to render us partakers of the benefits of his death, without any repetition of the action, annually or otherwise; the λύτρωσις being (as the Apostle adds) αἰώνια. So Theophyl.: οὐ πρόσκαιρον καθαρμὸν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλ’ αἰώνιαν ἐλευθερίαν ψυχικῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

13, 14. εἰ γὰρ—καθαρότητα. It is observed by Dind., that this, together with the preceding, contains a conclusion *a minori ad majus*.” Ταύρων is for μόσχων; as being young bullocks: and indeed the words are used promiscuously in the Sept. and Philo, who at p. 675. says, that the ταύρος and μόσχος are offered πρὸς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων. He then says, that the goat is σύμβολον τελείων, ὃ καθαίρει καὶ κενοῖ ψυχὴν ἁμαρτημάτων.

13. καὶ σποδὸς δαμαλέως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους, “the ashes of a heifer sprinkling (i. e. sprinkled over) the defiled.” (See Num. 19.); from which, mixed with water, was compounded a sort of holy liquid, whose sprinkling purified and admitted to society and divine worship those who had been defiled by touching a dead body or a sepulchre. Κεκοινωμένοι, *defiled*. So Philo: ἀκαθάρτοι καὶ μεμιασμένοι. (Rosem.) This use of *καινῶ* is very rare in the Classical writers; and no example is adduced of it by the philologists. Yet I find one noted in my adversaria (though I have inadvertently omitted to mention the name of the author, probably Josephus or Philo) κακῶς ἔζων οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐκοινῶνουν, where it is plain we must read ἐκοίνουν.

13. ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, “so cleanses and restores to legal holiness, or the external purity above mentioned.” Ποσὼ μᾶλλον—ζῶντι, “how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the external spirit offered himself to God a perfect victim, cleanse your minds and consciences from dead and sinful works, that ye may serve the living God.” The only real difficulty these words contain is in the διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, of which it is no easy matter to settle the meaning. Various have been the interpretations (which may be seen detailed in Pole, Wolf, and Dind.). Most of the antients and the earlier moderns understand it of the *divine nature* of Christ. And this interpretation is ably supported by Grot., Limb., Braun, Wolf., Schoettg. Vitringa, Ernesti, Cramer, Storr, and Carpz., which last Commentator fortifies it from Banab., Epirt. C. 6., and Theophyl. Others, as Abp. Tillots. and Drs. Owen and Dodd., interpret it of the *holy spirit*; urging Christ’s being conceived, proclaimed, anointed, working miracles, and at last laying down his life by *this spirit*. Thus (Dodd. observes) it seems a plain testimony to the eternity, and consequently the *deity* of the spirit. Most of the recent foreign Commentators, however, are of opinion that πνεῦμα here signifies *life*, i. e. διὰ πνεύματος αἰῶνιου, may mean “per vitam eternam.” (See more in Heinr., Dodd., and Rosenm.) This, however, appears to be an interpretation founded in error, and does not bear the stamp of truth. The same may be said of most of the modes of *tampering* with the important word πνεῦμα, found in the foreign theologians. I confess that, after all, I see no interpretation so safe as the common one, first mentioned; though I cannot enter into any particulars of comparison between that and the *second*; but must refer to the writers above adverted to.

Συνειδ. is well explained by Theophyl. “the inner manner;” by Œcumen, the *mind*. And the *conscience* must be included. Νεκρὰ ἔργα, *sinful deeds*.

See the note, *supra* 6, 1. By the Θεῶ ζωντι, is meant the only true, the eternal, and omnipotent God. See Braun.

15. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν.

And because this new covenant is not of victims, but has to be established and ratified by the blood of the mediator himself, therefore *he* is the mediator of the new Covenant. It has, however, long been a matter of dispute, whether διαθ. should here be rendered *covenant*, or *testament*.* The latter opinion is supported by many eminent moderns, and, among the more recent ones, by Carpz. And this the context seems to require. Most of the later Commentators, from the time of Le Clerc., think that *both* significations, *covenant*, and *testament*, may have place; there being here a play upon the double sense of διαθήκη. For which criticism, however, Le Clerc incurred the severe castigation of Wolf, Oder, Twells, and Carpz. Dind., however, thinks that dispute merely turns on *words*; namely, because the *mystical* sense was called (popularly) a *lusus*. True; but Le Clerc's whole language was *indecorous*, not to say *profane*; and therefore highly censurable; though I see nothing so very objectionable in the criticism itself; since examples of this kind of *lusus*, on the different significations of a word, as also the *paronomasia*, are frequent among the ancients, and not uncommon in our Apostle. Alberti and Dind. adduce two examples from Philo, certainly one of the gravest of writers, where there is a similar play on these two senses of διαθήκη. See p. 1052. If this be not admitted, and the *mediator* be thought (as Doddr. maintains) "a very improper expression," we may, with Whitby, Pierce, Doddr., and Mackn., render it *covenant* (See Macknight's note). I, however, agree with Mr. Slade (who has here a copious and able annotation), that it is least exceptionable to suppose, that the Apostle, in ver. 16 & 17., is taking advantage of the two-fold sense of διαθήκη, intimating that it is applicable to the Christian dispensation, not only as denoting a *covenant* (which is the usual signification of the word in *Scripture*), but also in its *general* acceptance, of a *testament*.

* The state of the question is thus treated on by Slade. "To the common translation there are several objections. 1st., The very notion of a first *testament* is incorrect, for the Mosaic dispensation cannot be considered in that light. 2nd., We cannot speak of the *mediator* of a *testament*. 3rd., The argument fails, respecting the necessity of the testator's death, because the validity of the old dispensation did not depend upon such an event. 4th., A *testament* was never ratified by sacrifice, and, therefore, such a construction here would exclude the doctrine of expiation. It appears that the word διαθήκη must, in this verse, signify a *covenant*, as it always does in the Sept. To this the great objection lies in ver. 16 & 17., where mention is made of the death τοῦ διαθεμένου; for a *covenant* by no means requires the death of a contracting party in order to its ratification."

the death of a testator being not less requisite to the operation of a will, than the death of a victim to the validity of a covenant. And so (he adds) Dr. Wells. Whitby's arguments have been well answered by Mr. Slade, who also further pre-occupies an objection to the proposed interpretation, namely, that it appears to introduce a *sophism*. "The passage (he truly remarks) might have been intended not as a proof, but a detached illustration, showing that the Gospel (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη), whether regarded as a *testament*, or a *covenant*, must be ratified by death."

At εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν—παραβάσεων must be understood ἀπὸ. And Rosenm. compares the Ciceronian phrase *liberatur culpæ*, for a *culpæ*. The ἐπὶ Rosenm. takes in the sense *in*. But it seems better to suppose it used in that of *sub*; as when speaking of the reign of a monarch, or the duration of a magistracy. Οἱ κεκλημένοι, i. e. *cum effectu*, as Grot. explains, *faithful Christians*. The ἐπαγγελία τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας signifies the promise of an eternal inheritance in the promised future felicity, so often represented as such; in order to show its certainty.

16. ὅπου γὰρ—διαθεμένου. As the Apostle had, in the preceding verse, made mention of *inheritance*, so he now glides into the idea of a *testament*. It is sufficient to observe, that the use of the word διαθ., necessarily involves the death of the testator. Ἀνάγκη is for ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶ; and φέρεσθαι is for ἔπρεσθαι, or γένεσθαι. (Rosenm.) But this seems too arbitrary and artificial. Others, as Grot. and Schleus., interpret the φέρεσθαι, *producere in foro*, i. e. "the death of the testator must be proved judicially." This, however, seems not a little harsh. I am surprised none of the Commentators should have seen that the sense is this: "A testament necessarily carries with it an idea of the death of the testator." The construction is as follows: ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ (διαθήκην ταύτην) φέρεσθαι θάνατον τοῦ διαθεμένου. The words following are illustrative.

17. διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία. This, Rosenm. observes, is what the Roman Jurisconsults mean, when they say, Testamentum morte confirmatur. And he, in conjunction with others, takes the ἐπὶ in the sense *after*. But it may signify *in the case of*; and μόνον is understood. βεβαία, *carried into effect*. Thus it answers to the μήποτε ἰσχύει, "produces no effect."

18. ὅθεν—ἐγκεκαίνισται, “whence not even the first covenant was made valid without blood.” The ὅθεν Rosenm. refers to ver. 15., and paraphrases, “that there should be some similitude between the old and this new form of religion.” Ἐγκεκαίνισται, *was made valid, ratum, factum est.* So Chrys. explains: βεβαία γέγονεν ἐκυρώθη. A remarkable signification, which may (I think) be best accounted for thus, Ἐγκαινίζειν, like קָנָה, signifies, properly, to *renew*, and also to *use for the first time*, Anglicè to *handsel*; and, as *using* any thing is a confirmation of its being ours, or, in our power, so קָנָה and ἐγκαινίζειν came to be applied to denote the *solemn* handselling of any thing by various rites, whereby its possession was confirmed and ratified; indeed we retain the remains of this custom in what is familiarly called a *house-warming*. Hence the term was applied to the establishing, confirmation, and consummation of any covenant which is the signification here required; and although the above mode of evolving it differs from any yet proposed, I think it will be found correct. The Apostle has reference to Ex. 24, 1—8.

19, 20. λαληθείσης—τῷ λαῷ, “for when Moses had recited the whole Law (the formula of the covenant) to the people; as had been prescribed (by God).” Πᾶσα ἐντολή, all the precepts in Ex. 21, 22 and 23. Λαλεῖν may very well denote *recitation*. The κατὰ νόμον, Theophyl., Beza, and the best recent Commentators, rightly render, “by command of God;” for there is no article, and the context requires this sense. Μετὰ ὕδατος. “At Ex. 24, 6. (observes Rosenm.), it is only said, that the people were sprinkled with the blood of the victims; but that it was usual for water to be mixed with the blood, we learn from Levit. 14, 49—51., where also mention is made of the scarlet wool and hyssop.” Τὸ αἷμα may be rendered *blood*; for the Hebrew (confirmed by the Sept. and Philo) has חֲצִי, “the half of the blood.” With respect to the water and the branch of hyssop, they are not mentioned by Moses;

though they may very well be accounted for, as being (to use the words of Gom., Germ., Est., and Rib.) “*aspersio instrumenta commoda, ne sanguis aspergendus concrederet* :” for the wool imbibes and retains the moisture, and the hyssop serves for the sprinkling. That the *περιῤῥαντήριον* was formed of hyssop and scarlet wool, we learn from Levit. 14. ; and that hyssop was used in sprinkling, from Ps. 51, 7., Ex. 12, 22.

With respect to the *αὐτὸ τε τὸ βιβλίον*, some would join it with the *preceding*, in order to remove the seeming discrepancy between this and the Mosaic account, where it is only said, that the *people* were sprinkled. But that is doing violence to the construction ; and as the account in question contains *other additions* to (though not *variations* from) the Mosaic account, it may be tolerated. And, as the *altar* was sprinkled, it is probable that the book was so likewise, just as it lay on the altar. These particulars are supposed to have been derived from tradition. They are, however, adverted to by the Apostle in the manner of things well known to his readers.

By the *πάντα τὸν λαόν*, some (considering the great number of the people, 600,000,) suppose only their *representatives*. Others think that the words being slowly and loudly pronounced by Moses, were communicated by heralds to all the assembled multitude. Both conjectures are devoid of authority, or even probability. The *first* cannot be thought of ; and as to the latter, it is too formal and hypothetical. The words, or the substance of them, would be transmitted to, and become known to, all the people, without the intervention of *heralds* ; for it was not necessary that they should all have this knowledge at the *same instant*.

20. *λέγων· Τοῦτο—Θεός*. Exod. 24, 8. The *διαθήκη ἐντέλλεσθαι* is for the preceding *διαθήκη συντελεῖν, ποιεῖν, ἐγκαινίζειν*. In the Hebrew we have *קָרַב*, *cut*, which has reference to the cattle slaughtered at

entering into a treaty. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς is for ὑμῖν, “for your benefit.” (Rosenm.)

21. καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν—ἐρράντισε. In the Mosaic account of this dedication we do not read that the tabernacle with all its vases was sprinkled with blood. Though this circumstance is also mentioned by Joseph. Ant. 3, 8, 6., and Philo 675 & 676. (Dind.)

22. καὶ σχεδὸν—καθαρίζεται. Grot. and Rosenm. observe, that σχεδὸν is said *prudenter*; since some were cleansed with water, others purified with fire. Καὶ χωρὶς αἵματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. Now, under the Law, no expiation was performed without blood shedding. To which purpose, the Commentators cite Maimon. de Pasch. 1, 6., fundamentum sacrificii in aspersione consistit, and the Talmud: Non est expiatio, nisi per sanguinem. In sacrifices where all things were purified with blood, that the ἄφεσις ἀμαρτημάτων was supposed to be attained, is clear from the words of Philo, p. 840. (cited by Carpz. and Dind.), τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ βωμῷ, δι’ οὗ πάντων ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ παρανομημάτων ἀπολύσεις γίνονται, καὶ παντελεῖς ἀφέσεις. *Why* no expiation was held good without the shedding of blood, see Morus, cited by Rosenm.

23. ἀνάγκη—ταύτας. Now follows the *conclusion*. “It was, therefore, necessary that the shadow of heavenly things (the tabernacle) should be purified with *these*, but *heaven itself*, with *better* sacrifices than these;” i. e. “it was necessary that an approach to Heaven should be afforded by a more efficacious sacrifice.” On ὑπόδειγμα see 8, 5. Now, all things done by the tabernacle worship, and the priesthood of the Old Law, were but a *shadow* of heavenly things. Therefore, it was enough for them to be consecrated to sacred uses by *these*, namely, by the blood of bulls and goats. But *those* (namely, the heavenly) were to be dedicated κρείττοσι θυσίαις, i. e. with the sacrifice of Christ alone. The Plural is here used for the Singular; as Matt. 21, 7. An enallage common in the Classical writers. In καθαρίζεσθαι, there is a metonymy such as we often find,

when things partly similar, partly dissimilar, are compared. For, as by the legal purification an entrance was afforded to the sanctuary, so, by taking the effect for the cause, heaven is said καθαρίζεσθαι, instead of saying, that an entrance by them is given to that heaven. (Rosenm.) Heinr. takes καθαρίζεσθαι *actively*, supplying ἡμᾶς; and he regards ὑποδ. καθαρ. θυσίας as an *exquisitius dictum*. Schleus. Lex. understands *expiation*. Παρὰ τούτας. The ratio of this idiom is not well seen by the recent Commentators. The words simply mean *compared with, or than*, these. So our *than* is derived from a verb signifying to *compare*.

24. οὐ γὰρ—οὐρανόν. The force of χειροποιητ. has been explained, *supra*, ver. 11. Ἀντίτυπ. is nearly synonymous with ὑπόδειγμα, παραβολή, σύμβολον (which terms are promiscuously used by Philo); and on this term I have before treated. See also Carpz. and Schleus. Lex. The *sentiment* is as follows: “Christ did not enter into the *human* holy of holies, which was only an image representing the true one, namely, heaven, but into *heaven itself*. Νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, sub. εἰς τὸ or ὥστε, *in order to*. On the signification of ἐμφανισθῆναι the Commentators somewhat differ. The best founded opinion seems to be, that it denotes to *present himself, appear before*. It is, we are told, a forensic term; as Acts 24, 1., 25, 2 & 15. But it means not only *present oneself at a royal court*, to obtain *justice*, but *plead the cause of another*. See Ernesti, Carpz., and Dindl., in loc. Here, by the context (especially the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν following), it must signify *appear*, to plead our cause, to deprecate the wrath of God, and obtain our pardon. It is observed by Rosenm., that the High Priest is said to appear *before God*, when he stands at the ark. By which it was declared that the solemn expiation was then made. So Christ entered into Heaven, and stood at the right hand of the Father. Now, therefore, it is declared that the whole expiation is effected, and

that pardon is obtained for men by the death of Christ. See c. 7, 25.

25, 26. οὐδ' ἴνα—ἀλλοτριῶ. The οὐδὲ belongs, not to ver. 24., but ver. 23.; and the οὐ γὰρ and οὐδὲ correspond to each other. Thus ἀνάγκη must be repeated. The sense is: "Neither was it necessary that he should offer himself *often*, as the High Priests enter the temple every year with *another's* blood. The *offering* of Christ was his *passion* and *death*, infinitely superior to the offering of the High Priests, and especially as requiring only once to be made, and not having need that Christ should descend from heaven, and repeat it annually, or ever again." Εὐ αἵμ. is for σὺν αἵμ. The ἀλλοτρι. is used, as better suited to the ἰδίῳ; but it has simply the sense of ἄλλος.

26. ἐπεὶ ἔδει—κόσμου. This is a parenthetical clause, in which, Dindorf thinks, there is a *reductio ad absurdum*. Though Grot. interprets the ἔδει *oportuisset* (ἀν being understood), as used not of *necessity*, but of what is *better* and more expedient; q. d. "if there had been any greater efficacy in a repeated offering, it would have been *expedient* that he should," &c. Νῦν δὲ. Α νῦν coming after a δὲ often (as here) denotes, not *time*, but *opposition*. And so Grot. The sense may be thus expressed: "*as things now are*; as there was no utility in a repeated offering." Ἀπαξ, *once for all*. Ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, "at the conclusion of the ages," i. e. the last of the Dispensations, the fulness of time. See 1 Cor., 10, 11., and the notes. Ernesti renders, "in ultimâ mundi parte." Εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, "for the putting away and abolition of sin." See Dan. 9, 24. Διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωνται, "he hath been manifested by his own sacrifice;" as ἐμφανισθῆναι at ver. 24. So the High Priest had to appear annually before God. It is observed by Carpz., that this is a *verbum sacrificantis in terrâ*, equivalent to ἐγγίξειν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν θυσίαν προσφέρειν. And so in Philo 1097, sacrificers are said

ἐγγίξειν, and φανεροῦσθαι τῷ Θεῷ. There is an evident allusion to his *thus* presenting his sacrifice.

27, 28. καὶ καθ' ὅσον—κρίσις. The Apostle shows by a new argument, derived *a simili*, that Christ ought *once* only to offer *himself*, namely, because his sacrifice and death were one and the same. Nor does he properly intend to affirm that all men must die, but that it is appointed for them *once* to die, *and* after death, nothing shall remain but judgment. (Dind.) So Theophyl. : Νῦν καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν λέγει διὰ τί ἅπαξ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Χριστὸς· διότι, φησὶν, ἐνὸς θανάτου ἀντίλυτρον ἐγένετο. Ἀπέκειτο γὰρ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν· τοῦτο οὖν τὸ ἅπαξ ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ πάντων.

The καθ' ὅσον is for καθὼς. Ἀπόκειται, “it is divinely decreed and appointed.” Dindorf here observes, that ἀποκ. is used not only of *rewards*, but of every thing *appointed* and *destined* to be. And Wets. and Kypke adduce numerous Classical examples, not, however, very apposite. On the *senti-ment* it is well observed by Rosenm. : “Opponuntur sibi hominum mors et κρίσις; Jesu mors et κρίσις: κρίσις Jesu, ut *judicis*, hominis ut *judicandi*.”

28. οὕτως—σωτηρίαν.

Here ἅπαξ signifies *once for all*. See the note on Rom. 3, 21. Προσενεχθεῖς, scil. *eis* θυσίαν, “being offered up by himself.” So Theophyl. : ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θῦμα, καὶ ἱερεῖον. The πολλῶν is for πάντων, “all who should lay hold on his salvation by faith and obedience.” “It is not to be understood (says Dr. Wells) that Christ was once offered to bear the sins only of some certain persons, but that he was offered for the sins of the whole world; though wicked men, by their impenitence, lay not hold of this benefit; and so it comes to pass, that Christ actually bears only the sins of *many*; viz. of such as believe and obey the Gospel, and so actually enjoy the benefit of Christ's oblation, according to Heb. 5, 9.” So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) : Τίνας δὲ ἔνεκεν εἶπε, πολλῶν, καὶ οὐ πάντων; ἐπειδὴ μὴ πάντες ἐπίστευσαν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ θάνατος αὐτοῦ ἀντίρροπος ἦν τῆς πάντων ἀπωλείας, καὶ ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἀπέθανεν· οὐ πάντων δὲ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκε, διὰ τὸ μὴ θελῆσαι αὐτοῦς. Ὡστε ἄχρηστον ἑαυτοῖς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐποίησαν. So also Theodoret: Τῶν οὖν πεπιστευκότων μόνων τὰς ἁμαρτίας διέλυσε. See also Œcumen. Theophyl. notices that πολλῶν may be taken for πάντων; as at Matt. 20, 28. And so most recent Interpreters, who might have cited the Virgilian *Unum pro multis dabitur caput*. It comes to the

same thing; and, in either way, the passage is rescued from Calvinistic perversion. It may be observed, too, that this and the preceding passage are remarkable for containing a direct assertion of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ; on which see Braun in loc., and the excellent work of Abp. Magee on the Atonement.

Ἐκ δευτέρου. See the note of Limb., or the substance of it detailed by Doddr. Χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. The sense of this term is obscure and uncertain; consequently Commentators differ in opinion. Whitby, Mich., Storr, Morus, Schleus, Mackn., and others, take ἁμαρτ. to mean a *sin-offering*. But see the well founded objections of Dind. and Slade. The usual signification of the word may very well be retained; and, with Carpzov, Rosenm., Dind., and Slade, we may render: "sine peccati nostri onere, quod sibi ferendum imposuit, quod in crucem sustulisse dicitur;" or, with Hamm., Pierce, and Doddr., "without any of those sufferings which he underwent as an atonement for sin;" which comes to the same thing. The sense, then, is: "without having occasion again to bear our sins, by the sufferings he formerly underwent as an atonement for them." The εἰς σωτηρίαν may be construed either with ὁφθήσεται, or with ἀπεκδεχομένοις. The former method is supported by the antients, the Syr., and the most eminent moderns; the latter, "who look to him for salvation," by Castell., Wolf, and Slade, who compare Phil. 3, 20. But that passage is not of the same nature; and it may be questioned whether it can bear any such sense. The former construction is undoubtedly the true one.

The whole passage is admirably explained by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) thus: Ὁφθήσεται δὲ ἐκ δευτέρου οὐκέτι ἁμαρτίας ἐπιφερόμενος, οὐδὲ θανάτου δευτέρου δι' αὐτὸς δεόμενος, ἀλλ' ὡς κριτὴς εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις, τουτέστι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐλπίζουσι τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν· πρόδηλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἀξίως αὐτῆς ζῶσι. Καιτοιγε οὐ μόνον εἰς σωτηρίαν ἤξει, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τιμωρίαν τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν· ἀλλ' ὅμως τὸ φαῖδρον εἶπε.

CHAP. X.

The Apostle proceeds to treat of the imperfection of the Mosaic Law, and the perfection of the Christian religion, also the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for our sins, ver. 1—18. (Ern.) This Chapter is not connected with the words immediately preceding, nor contains the reason of them; but relates to what was said on the entering in of the Priest to the sanctum sanctorum every year ἐν αἵματι ἁλλοτρίῳ; whereas Christ offered *himself*. The *cause* he deduces from the variety of sacrifices, and the nature of the law. (Dind.)

VERSE 1. *σχίαν*—*πραγμάτων*, “For the Law holding out only a shadow of the future and heavenly blessings, not the very figure and substance of them.” *Ἔχων*, “since it held out.” *Σκίαν*, i. e. a faint *sketch* or *outline*, opposed to which is the *εἰκὼν*, or the *figure filled up*, and become a complete and substantial form. So *εἶδος*, 2 Cor. 5, 7. See Chrys., Theophyl., and Œcumen., and also Dind. The *μέλλοντα ἀγαθὰ* denotes, not the *heavenly sanctuary*, as Pierce fancies, but, as the best antient and modern Commentators are agreed, *the benefits obtained by Christ*, true forgiveness of sins, and admission to eternal happiness. See 9, 11.

1. *κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν*—*τελειῶσαι*. There is here a *trajectio* and *synchysis*; and the construction is thus laid down by Rosenm. *οὐδέποτε δύναται τελειῶσαι τοὺς προσερχομένους κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν* (sc. *ιερεῖς*) *εἰς διηλεκές*. By the *προσερχομένους* are meant those who approached to the altar (as Heb. 11, 6.), such as the Apostle afterwards calls the *λατρεύοντας*, or *worshippers*. *Τελειῶσαι*, *make perfect*, fully expiate, and free from sin, i. e. *quoad mentem et conscientiam*.

2. *ἐπεὶ οὐκ*—*κεκαθαρμένους*. Many MSS. and other authorities read *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν*, which is approved by most Critics, and has been received by Griesbach. Thus the words will be taken *interrogatively*, with this sense: “Would not those sacrifices have ceased to be offered up every year?” And they remark that *ἐπεὶ* may commence an interrogative sentence; as in Rom. 3, 6. and Aristoph. Nub. 689. Carpzov, however, thinks the common reading (which is, moreover, found in Chrys.), is more agreeable to the *simple* assertion which follows. And he observes that Philo often uses *ἐπειδὴ* and *ἐπειδὴν* in the sense *siquidem, ceteroquin*. The sense is the same on either reading: but I see no sufficient reason to abandon the common one. Particles are often *introduced* ex emendatione, and that arising from *misapprehension*; which seems to be the case *here*. The reading *καὶν*,

was *another* emendation : for I remember no instance of ἐπεὶ and οὐκ coming together. What are the “critical reasons” for the new reading I am at a loss imagine.

The sense is : “ otherwise (if men could not by these sacrifices have been perfectly expiated) they would have ceased being offered.” For here, as in many other instances, the Greek and English idioms coincide. See Viger. and Matth. Gr. Gr.

2. διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν—κεκαθαρμένους, “ by reason of the worshippers, once purified, having no longer any consciousness of sin, to deserve punishment and need expiation ;” or, “ they would have been freed from the consciousness of sin, and the solicitude and anxiety thence resulting.” Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. in loc. well explains the use of συνειδ. by the Apostle thus : “ Sacrificia expiatoria V. T. non poterant sine fide in Messiam sic expiare peccata, ut conscientiæ hominum propterea tranquillæ fuerint, nullosque peccatorum morsus ultra senserint. Sed sacrificium Christi fide a credentibus apprehensum conscientias sic tranquillas reddit, ut a metu peccatorum planè sint immunes.”

3. ἀλλὰ ἔν αὐταῖς—ἐνιαυτὸν. At αὐταῖς must be understood θυσίαις, and (as Ernesti thinks) μονῇ after ἀνάμνησις. The sense is : “ But in these sacrifices there is only an annual commemoration (by the High Priest, on the day of expiation) of the sins (committed) during the year.” So Theophyl. explains : οὐδὲν ἅμα κατόρθουσιν αἱ θυσίαι, εἰ μὴ μόνον ἀνάμνησιν ἁμαρτιῶν, τουτέστιν, ἔλεγχον. Οὐ γὰρ ἄφεσιν παρέχουσιν, ἀλλ’ ἀποδεικνύουσι διὰ τοῦ αἰεὶ προσφέρεσθαι, ὅτι ἄλυτοι εἰσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τοῦ λαοῦ. Εἰ γὰρ ἐλύθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, τι ἔδει θυσιῶν ;

4. ἀδύνατον—ἁμαρτίας. The Apostle (Theoph. observes) strengthens the reasoning ἀπὸ τῆς εὐτελείας τῶν προσαγόμενων, καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους τοῦ νοσήματος. By ἁμαρτ. is meant the *reatus*, and the consequent *punishment* resulting from it. Now the blood of bulls and goats could only produce a corporeal or legal purity, could

not cleanse the conscience, or free us from all sin; as does the blood of Christ. See Carpzov, who cites a passage of Philo 3, 675 c., where it is said that all sacrifices are only symbols of the purification of the mind.

5. διὸ εἰσερχόμενος—ἡθέλησας, “Wherefore, to show this, where the Messiah is described as coming into the world and commencing his work, he saith: “Sacrifices thou desirest not, but a body hast thou purified me.” “The Apostle (says Mr. Valpy) opening the great plan of redemption, introduces the Saviour as thus addressing his Father. See the 6th and following verses of Ps. 40., which is a prophecy of Christ, upon the assumption of the human nature.” At εἰσερχ. the recent Commentators subaud ὡς, and render the εἰσερχ. *venturus*, as if *about* to come. But this is a needless refinement. Of course, it must mean his coming *from heaven* into this world; and Whitby here ably refutes the gloss of the Socinians, by which they would evade this proof of the pre-existence of Christ in heaven before he came into the world. λέγει, i. e. saith by the mouth of David, who there (Ps. 40, 6 seqq.) speaks in the person of the Messiah.

5. σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι. As to the remarkable discrepancy here between the Heb. and the Sept., I cannot notice the conjectures which have been hazarded, to account for that difference, or the refinements of interpretation by which they are attempted to be reconciled. See Pole, Wolf, and Dindorf. It may be sufficient to say that it is the opinion of the most judicious, that the discrepancy may best be removed by supposing that the Sept. have translated *freely*, giving the real, though not the literal sense; explaining it (as Mr. Slade says, to whose note I refer for their particulars), in the way of paraphrase, to those for whom they translated. See Rom. 3, 12. There can be no doubt but the phrase σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι must be understood of Christ's being clothed and fitted with a human body

for the purpose of making the sacrifice in question. The sense intended by the Apostle is expressed by Rosenm. thus: "Since the sacrifices enjoined by the Law of Moses could not take away sins, Christ was pleased to offer up *himself*, and by this sacrifice to expiate and bring us to salvation."

6. ὑλοκαυτώματα—εὐδόκησας. At περὶ ἁμαρτίας must be understood θυσίαν, Heb. מִנְחָה, a *sin-offering*. Οὐκ εὐδόκησας. A stronger term than the οὐκ ᾔτησας of the Sept. and the לֹא שָׁאַל of the Hebrew. But St. Paul regarded (and rightly) the verb שָׁאַל as put *per meiosis*.

7. τότε εἶπον—σου. At τότε there seem to be some words omitted, which may be thus supplied: "Seeing, then (said I), that thou art not appeased by sacrifices, I said, Behold, here am I, ready to obey thee, and fulfil all thy will." Thus τότε must neither be taken in sensu χρονικῶ, nor be regarded, with Heinr., Mich., and Dind., as pleonastic. At του ποιῆσαι must be understood ἕνεκα, which is for εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι.

Instead of κεφαλίδι other Translators have εἰλήματι or βιβλίῳ, or τεύχει. The Heb. מַגֵּל undoubtedly signifies a *roll*. But the best Critics have observed that κεφαλὴς may be no more; since it was so called, with a reference to the *wooden rolls*, or staves, about which the parchment was rolled up; having at the ends, or (I should conjecture) *one* end, a piece of turnery, which, from bearing some rude resemblance of a *head* (as sometimes we see on walking-sticks), might give name to the whole. By the κεφ. is, I think, with Doddr., meant the Pentateuch, with allusion to the general predictions in it of the Messiah.

8, 9. ἀνώτερον—εἶρηκεν. Rosenm., after observing that these are not the words of the Psalm, but of St. Paul, notices that it was not unusual for writers (as Philo) to take another's words, and then to bring them forward, member by member, and deduce arguments from them. And he lays down the *sentiment* from ver. 5—9. thus: "Obedience is better

than external sacred rites. This obedience Christ rendered, by willingly and promptly submitting himself to death, to this end, that we should be purified from sin, and obtain pardon and acceptance."

9. ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον—στήσῃ. Such is usual in disjunctive syllogisms. Τὸ πρῶτον, the Levitical sacrifices. Τὸ δεύτερον, i. e. τὸ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Αἰρεῖν, like ἀθετεῖν and καταργεῖν, signifies to *abrogate*. Ἰστάναι signifies to *set up, confirm*. The meaning is, that the precept respecting sacrifices will now cease, and another will hence have place, which the Messiah had promised when he declared that he would do the will of his Father. (Rosenm.)

10. ἐν ᾧ—ἐφάπαξ. The θελημα. is explained by Ernesti נְצִיחַ, εὐδοκία, *good pleasure* of God: for to God the Father, the antients, and most moderns refer it; on which see Mackn. and Whitby ap Slade. By Carpzov and Rosenm. it is referred both to God the Father, and God the Son. And Rosenm. adds: "quia Deus hoc a Jesu fieri voluit, et Jesu id quod voluerat Deus, fecit." It is observed by Dind.: "Agitur hic tantum de sacrificio, quo Christus semet Patri obtulit, in eoque ejus voluntatem sive mandata exsecutus est, quæ duplicis quidem generis erant, ut partim homines sanioris religionis cognitione imbueret, partim eorum causa mortem subiret." Ἁγιασμένοι, "purified from sin." For, as Rosenm. and Dind. observe, ἀγιάζειν is synonymous with καθαίρειν, and has reference to the sacred κάθαρσις to be obtained by piacular and various kinds of washings. The sense, then, is, that "we are rendered pure, and obtain pardon and acceptance *solely* by the offering of the body of Christ." Ἐφάπαξ, i. e. once for all, by an act neither needing nor *admitting* of repetition, on which our pardon may safely be rested, since it will be for ever availing, and not be *temporary*, like that of the sacrifices of the old dispensation.

11. καὶ πᾶς—θυσίας. The Apostle proceeds to show the infinite superiority of Christ to the High

Priests of the Old Testament, especially since *they* were only ministers and servants, but Christ is *Lord*. (Rosenm.) This verse, Braun thinks, coheres with ver. 12, 13, and 14. And here the Apostle brings forward a new argument for the sufficiency of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, or rather confirms what had been already said. Λειτουργία may refer to those parts (doubtless the most dignified) which the High Priest had assigned to him in the ministration. The ἔστηκε may be not without force; since (as Braun observes) no Priest was allowed to *sit down* in the temple, on pain of death; though Chrys. says: ἄρα τὸ ἐστάναι τοῦ λειτουργεῖν ἐστὶ σημεῖον· οὐκοῦν τὸ καθῆσθαι, τοῦ λειτουργεῖσθαι. Rosenm., too, recognizes an antithesis in πολλάκις and ἐφάπαξ προσφέρειν.

12, 13. αὐτὸς δὲ—Θεοῦ. The ἐκάθισεν is rightly said, by Rosenm., to denote the *majesty and dignity* of Christ, though that rather confirms the sense of ἔστηκε in the preceding verse, which he rejects. For in the *temple* every Priest was compelled to *stand*, as being in the court of the Great King; but Christ *sits* in the *presence* of God, and that at his right hand, and is σύμβροτος. The force of the comparison is obvious.

On ver. 13. see the note on 1, 13. By *the enemies of God*, Dind. says, is meant whatever hinders the salvation Christ wishes to obtain for his servants, namely, sinful actions, superstition, idolatry, and death itself; as is explained by the Apostle's words at 1 Cor. 15, 26." But this seems an unwarrantable refinement: for though *actions* may be *included*, yet surely the *persons* by whom the actions are performed, must be chiefly understood. *Who* these persons are, Braun has well shown, who also observes that the ἐν δεξιᾷ, though propounded ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, must be understood Θεοπρεπῶς; since it is sometimes used of *God*; as Is. 30, 38.

14. μίᾳ γὰρ—ἀγιαζομένους, "For by one sacrifice he hath for ever expiated those that were to be redeemed." Τετέλ., Dind. observes, answers to the

phrase ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιεῖν at ver. 18., and to περιελεῖν at ver. 11. And Carpz. and Dind. think that the words εἰς τὸ διηγεκὲς belong to τετελ.; though some refer them to προσφ.; others, to ἁγιαζ.

15—17. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ—μνησθῶ ἔτι. The δὲ signifies *moreover*. Μαρτυρεῖ, *bears testimony, teaches*, namely, that we are expiated and blessed. Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Here (Carpz. observes) is a proof of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; since him whom at ver. 15 he calls the Holy Spirit, he at 16. calls Κύριος, for which the Hebrew original is יהוה. Rosenm. notices that the words μετὰ τὸ προειρηκέναι are connected with ver. 16.; and at the beginning of ver. 17. must be understood εἴτ' ἐπιλέσει. “For (continues he) the *nervus probandi* is in ver. 17. ‘the sins committed by them I will remember no more,’ i. e. I will remit and not punish (as *supra* 8, 12.):” and this is partly clear from the introduction of the words at ver. 18., and partly from many things being omitted after ver. 16., which had been brought forward at 8, 8. seq.

18. ὅπου δὲ—ἁμαρτίας. The argument goes to prove the insufficiency of the Priesthood of the Old Testament. The *major* is certain. For oblation is made in order to the obtaining of remission. Now since they could obtain no perfect remission, but only a typical one, which was rather a πάρεσις and ἀνοχή; therefore the προσφορά remained, and was to be every day repeated. Whence it follows, “where there is perfect remission of sin, no oblation can have place;” for it would thus be vain. The *minor* is this: that under the New Covenant there is a perfect remission of sins. (Braun.) To this purpose Carpz. cites Philo 675 c. and 843 c. whence it appears that in a sacrifice for sin there was said to be sought παρὰ τῆς ἱεω τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἀμνηστία ἀδικημάτων; for that bulls and calves were slain περὶ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων.

19, 20. ἔχοντες οὖν—Ἰησοῦ.

I would render: “Since then, brethren, we have obtained a privilege for an entrance into the Holies (i. e. heaven), through (the efficacy of) the blood of Christ, to which entrance he hath prepared

for us a new and perpetual way, by the removal of the veil, even his body." Here (observes Rosenm.) there commences a new section of the Epistle, which has been hitherto *doctrinal*, showing the sufficiency of Christ's Priesthood, and the weakness of the Aaronitish. Now the Apostle proceeds to the *hortative, consolatory, and confirmatory*, which extends to the end of the Epistle." In the εἰσόδον τῶν ἁγίων there is an allusion to the rite of the Old Testament which forbade entrance to the Sanct. Sanctorum to any but the High Priest. Now (it is shown) by the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, *all* the faithful as well as *Priests*, are admitted to the *Christian* Sanctum Sanctorum, even heaven itself. Παρρησία, *liberty, privilege*. See supra, 3, 16. 4, 16. "Εν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦς, i. e. (as Carpz. has shown) "by the virtue and efficacy of the blood of Jesus." So Theophyl.: διὰ τοῦ αἵματος. The ἐνεκαίνισεν Chrys. explains, "formed and himself entered upon," literally, *created*, i. e. first laid open and himself entered upon. Now he that lays open a road, is said to have prepared or made it. See note supra, 9, 18. Ὅδον πρόσφατον καὶ ἔωσαν. The adjective πρόσφατος properly signifies *newly slain, or recently spoken*; but chiefly the *latter*. At length, however, it came to merely mean *new-made* (like our *brand-new*), and, in a general way, *new*. Now this way to heaven might very well be so called, as having been hitherto unknown, and then first, and also *recently*, opened out, and trodden by Christ. (See Braun.) It is also called ἔωσαν, which is explained by Braun *tritam, well trodden*; by Rosenm. *amœnam, jucundam*; and by Ernesti *eternal*, with reference to the perpetual sacrifice of Christ. But all these interpretations are too fanciful. The only one that bears the stamp of truth is that of the antients and several moderns *vivificam*, which tends to life and happiness. So Theoph.: ζωοποιούσα, εἰς ζωὴν ἄγουσα, as opposed to the old road, which was θανατηφόρα. So at 6, 1. νεκρά is used of things which *lead* to death. See also Joh. 14, 6. Now *this* way, on the contrary (Theophyl. observes) εἰς ζῆν φέρει, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἔῃ, καὶ διαιωνίζει.

By the διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, almost all Commentators are agreed, is meant the veil of Christ's body. "For (observes Rosenm.) as the Pontifex Max. could not pass to the Sanctum Sanctorum, except by the removal of the veil; so neither could we, unless by the body of Christ suffering death (and therefore the removal of that veil) ascend to heaven." See also the copious annotation of Braun. But the ratio metaphoræ and the true sense is still better explained in the racy and nervous language of Theoph. (from Chrys.) as follows: Ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν ταύτην τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν, διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ὅτε γὰρ ἦρθη ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ αὕτη, καὶ ἀναλήφθη, τότε ἀπεκάλυψεν ἡμῖν τὰ οὐράνια. Διὸ καὶ εὐκαίρως καταπέτασμα αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσε· τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τὸ, ὅταν ἀρθῇ, ἀνακαλύπτειν τὰ ἔνδοξ.

21, 22. καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Repeat ἔχοντες from the preceding verse. The οἶκον Θεοῦ may mean the Christian congregation, the

Church (see 3, 6.) over which Christ presides. So Est., Menoch., Zeg., and others. And this interpretation is well defended by Grot. Theophyl., however, after noticing this interpretation (which is given by Æcumen. and Theodoret), adds *another*, which he prefers, namely, τὸν οὐρανὸν; observing: ἐν ἐκείνῳ γὰρ λειτουργεῖν τὸν Ἀρχιερέα λέγει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐντυγχάνοντα. And this is (I think, with reason) preferred by Gomar, Ribera, and most of the recent Commentators.

22. προσερχώμεθα. A term often (as also 11, 6.) used by the Apostle and Philo in the sense λατρεύω, *draw near (and worship)*. Μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας, as opposed to hypocritical piety, or inattentive prayer. So Theophyl.: ἀδόλου, ἀνυποκρίτου. Or it may mean, he thinks, ἀδιστακτου. And so Ernesti, “firmly trusting in the merits of Christ.” Thus (observes Dind.) the Hebrews say תַּמְנָה; as Is. 38, 4. where the Sept. has ἀληθινὴν καρδίαν. See also on Eph, 6, 5.” And this is supported by what follows, which seems exegetical.

22. ἐν πληροφροσῖα πίστεως, “with a full and undoubting faith.” See 1 Thess. 1, 5. Col. 2, 2. and the notes. I would compare Dionys. Hal. 729, 21. δόξα τε ἰσχυρὰ, καὶ οὐ πολὺ ἀπέχουσα πίστις εἶναι.

22. ἐρράντισμένοι—πονηρᾶς, “sprinkled as to our hearts, from a consciousness of evil.” So Ernesti: “animis a conscientia peccati puris purgatis.” “The effect (observes Rosenm.) is put for the cause.” I would compare Joseph. p. 6, 41. ἐπὶ συνειδότι πονηρῶ.

There is an allusion to the sacrificial rite by which the mind as well as the body of the worshipper was required to be pure. With respect to the λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῶ, this (Rosenm. observes) designates the external purity which is wont to be conjoined with internal holiness. And in the times of their Old Testament the Priests every day washed the bodies (see Exod. 29, 4. and Levit. 16, 4.); to which custom there is here an allusion. Ernesti thinks there is in these words an ἐξεργασία, or *parallelism*.

They cannot (he adds) be taken *proprie*, unless they be understood of *baptism*, which cannot here be meant.

23, 24. κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῇ, "Let us hold fast the profession of our hope of salvation by Christ." Ὁμολ. τῆς ἐλπίδος, "the profession of the religion which bids us hope." See the note on 3, 1. So ἐλπίς is used in 1 Pet. 3, 15. Theophyl. explains: τὴν ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἡμῖν τὴν ἐλπίδα. And he thinks the ὁμολ. has reference to the confession at baptism. Ἀκλινῇ, *firm, unwavering*. So Theophyl.: βεβαίαν. Wets. cites from Lucian, ἀκλινῇ τὴν ψυχὴν.

24. καὶ κατανοῶμεν—ἔργων, "Let us be mindful to excite each other to mutual love and liberality." Κατανοεῖν signifies properly to *mind*; and here, to *be mindful of*, have a care of, be studious of. Schleus. cites Is. 57, 1. Εἰς παροξυσμὸν, &c. "to excite each other to," or, "that we may be mutually excited, and feel a mutual emulation." So Theoph.: ἐπισκοποῦμεν εἴ τις ἐνάρετος, ἵνα τοῦτον μιμώμεθα. For, as Theodoret observes, σίδηρος σίδηρον θήγει, καὶ λίθος λίθῳ προστριβόμενος ἀποκρίει φλόγα. Παροξυσμὸς is a word of middle signification, and may, as here, include incitement to *good* as well as to *evil*. By the καλὰ ἔργα are plainly meant works of beneficence.

25. μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες—παρακαλοῦντες.

The ἐγκαταλ. is usually rendered *relinquentes, deserentes, leaving off*. But the sense seems to be, "failing in the duty of assembling yourselves together." For ἐπισυναγωγὴν is well explained by Theophyl. τὸ ἐπισυνάγεσθαι. The question, however, is, what is meant by ἐπισυν. Theodoret interprets it *συμφωνίαν*. And so many moderns understand it of *friendly society*. Ernesti takes it of the *agapæ*; others of apostasy from the Christian religion; others again, of collection for the poor. All these interpretations are open to various objections: and I see no one so probable as the *antient* and common ones, by which it is taken for the congregating themselves together for *public*, or at least *common worship*. That this interpretation is of great antiquity, appears from the term having been so used in the writings of the early councils, where the regulations of public worship are treated of. So Ignat. (cited by Grot.) πυκνότερον συναγωγὰς γινέσθωσαν. And again: σπουδάετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ δόξαν. See also Clemens and Just.

Mart. And so Theophyl. must have taken it ; since he adds : *μηδὲ χωρισμοὺς καὶ παρασυναγωγὰς ἐπιτηδεύειν*, “ and not studying separations or bye-meetings, dissenting assemblies.” Now this interpretation (notwithstanding what Ern. says) is very agreeable to the context ; and it is ably supported by Beza, Grot., Wolf, Carpz., Dind., and Rosenm. It is, with great probability, conjectured by Est. and Beza, that *ἐπισυναγ.* was used rather than *συναγ.*, in order the better to distinguish Christian assemblies from Jewish synagogues. To a neglect of public worship and schism the Hebrews (we are told) were too prone. And to this purpose Hillah (cited by Schoettg. Hor. Hebr.) says : “ *Qui separat e congregatione, non videbit consolationem quæ Ecclesiam tangit.*”

As to the context seeming to require us (as Homberg says) to understand the *ἐπισυναγ.* of *apostacy* (of which Whitby takes it), Grot. well remarks, that neglect of attendance on public worship is the *beginning* of apostacy. As to *private religious meetings*, like the *agapæ*, seeming more suitable to the context (as Ernesti contends), it is to be remembered that all Christian congregations were as yet small *conventicula*, or assemblies such as could conveniently meet at private houses, (which has been already shown in the notes to the former Epistles). Finally a desertion of the assemblies for worship was also sure to lead to the neglect of the *καλὰ ἔργα* just mentioned ; since the poor were chiefly relieved or supported by the collections made at such meetings. I cannot conclude without observing, that in proof of the high importance of public worship, we need only attend to the remark of one of the bitterest enemies of our religion (for we must remember, “ *fas est et ab hoste doceri*”), Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 4. p. 83. “ The devotion of the poet, or the philosopher, may be secretly nourished by prayer, meditation, and study : but the exercise of public worship appears to be the only solid foundation of the religious sentiments of the people, which derive their force from imitation and habit. The interruption of that public exercise may consummate, in the period of a few years, the important work of a national revolution. The memory of theological opinions cannot long be preserved without the artificial helps of priests and of books.” On this subject of public worship I beg to recommend to the attention of my readers the excellent treatise of Mr. Holden on the Christian Sabbath.

Καθὼς ἔθος τισὶν. This is by J. Capell. and Carpz. thought to be a litotes, such as in 1 Cor. 10, 7. Ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, scil. *ἐαυτοὺς*. Here most supply *ἐπισυνάγεσθαι*. But this seems too formal and frigid, and not agreeable to what follows. Indeed most Commentators seem at a loss *what* sense to assign. It seems to refer to the *παροξυσμὸν* at ver. 24., and must be extended to every kind of excitement to virtue and religion. Theophyl. well explains thus : ἀλλήλοις ὄντες εἰς παραμυθίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἕνα λουθεοῦντες, καὶ διδάσκοντες, καὶ παρηγοροῦντες. The words *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες*—*τισὶν* are, in some degree, parenthetical.

Τοσοῦτον—ἡμέραν. These words are by some interpreted of the destruction of Jerusalem, which may (they say) be connected with

the day of the Lord, or of judgment : since the Apostles themselves and other Christians supposed that, on Jerusalem being destroyed, their Lord would return, and release his followers from the prosecutions of the Jews. There is, however, no reason to abandon the common interpretation, *the day of judgment*, which seems to be required by the words following φοβερά τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως, καὶ πρὸς ζῆλος. Objections to it are indeed made, but such as admit of easy answer.

26, 27. Now is subjoined the *reason* why they should not fall off from their Christian profession, namely, that if, after having acknowledged the truth, they deliberately apostatize, there will remain to them no pardon of sins. A sentiment similar to one at 4, 6. (Dind.) It is observed by Braun, that ver. 26—32. form a connected section.

The ἀμαρτ. is explained by the best Commentators of *apostacy* from the Christian faith ; which, they say, is required by what precedes ; and they observe that ἐκουσίως is added, since for such a sin ignorance cannot be pleaded. But perhaps the ἀμ. may have reference to the *whole* of what preceded, and denote that kind of sinning which consists not only in apostacy from the faith, and abandoning the religion, but also a sort of *virtual apostasy*, by the non-observance of its injunctions : and ἐκουσίως is as suitable on this as on the former interpretation ; since such conduct is deliberate.

The phrase λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας is compared with the φωτισθῆναι, supra 6, 4., and taken to denote a *knowledge* of the true *doctrines* of the Gospel. But it seems to imply also that of the *moral duties* which it enjoins. Now to such, the Apostle adds, there remains no sacrifice of purification (i. e. as long as they continue such), but only a φοβερά τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως, a horrible expectation of future punishment ; for words signifying *expectation* are used both in malam and in bonam partem. Carpz. cites Philo 1070. προδοκία κακοῦ. And he might have added Thucyd. 7. ἐλπίδα τοῦ φόβου, for φοβέραν ἐλπίδα. On ἐδοχὴ itself see Sallier. on T. Mag. 280. The word is used by the Classical writers ; but not in

this sense. The *πυρὸς ζῆλος* plainly denotes the fiery anger of God (with which expression may be compared the *διάπυρος* and *αἶθων* of the Greek writers. See Blomf. on *Æschyl. Ag.* 444); so often in the Old Testament: and as fire is frequently said to *eat up* what it consumes and destroys, so the wrath of God destroys and casts into perdition τοὺς ὑπεναντίους, namely, those who oppose his true religion, apostasy either actual or virtual.

28. ἀθετήσας—ἀποθνήσκει. Here is an argument a *minori ad majus* by which it is shown, that those who apostatize from the Christian religion will suffer much heavier punishment than those who had sinned against the Mosaic Law. (Rosenm.) Ἀθετήσας τις, *he who set at nought, violated*, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains), ἐκουσίως. Now we are told that *any* transgression of the Law, however minute, if it could be traced to deliberation and wilfulness, was punished with death. By the τὸν νόμον, Braun says, is especially meant the *ceremonial law*, for a violation of *which*, he says, not even the High Priest, or the most dignified persons were excused.

28. χωρὶς οἰκτιρισμῶν, *without mercy or pardon*. The ἐπὶ in ἐπὶ δυσὶ ἢ τρισὶ is rendered by Rosenm., “*propter consensum duorum*.” But I prefer, with Dind., to take it to denote *condition*, i. e. literally, “(if convicted) *under* the testimony of.” Ἀποθνήσκει, “is put to death.”

29. πόσω—ἐνύβρισας; These words place in a very strong light the guilt of apostates and presumptuous sinners. The interjected δοκεῖτε has great elegance; as also the ἀξιωθ.; such kind of words being of middle signification. Καταπατεῖν, like *conculcare*, is a term denoting the utmost contempt and insult. I would compare Joseph. 1172, 32. φέρετε δὴ τοίνυν φέρετε πατούμενα βλέποντες τὰ ἅγια and 1179, 10. πατήσαντες τοὺς νόμους. The τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος signifies, regarding the blood of Christ, shed to ratify the Christian covenant, and by which we Christians are sanctified unto God, as a

thing common, as only the blood of a *man*, and that a malefactor. For if Jesus were *not* the Messiah, *such* he would necessarily be. The ἐνὸςβρ. answers to the καταπ. just before. This term signifies to *grossly insult*: and, after illustrating by examples the use of the word, Dind. remarks that the Apostle could not have employed a *stronger* term to designate a contemner of the Gospel. And (we may add from Bp. Middl.) it confirms the doctrine of the personality of the Spirit; for it does not appear that the verb ἐνὸςβρίζειν can have for its object *things* or *qualities*; it is applicable to *persons* only.

With respect to the πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος, I cannot but notice in the Foreign Commentators, with reprobation, the same perversion that so often attends their interpretations of this word. Some (as Schleus. in his Lex.) would take it to denote the *Christian religion*; others, as Heinr. and Dind., recognize a periphrasis for χάρις; thus effectually *silencing* the word. And so Jaspis, “summo Dei beneficio.” Somewhat preferable is the interpretation of Rosen., “*the gifts of the Spirit*,” which every apostate casts off. But I see no reason to abandon the interpretation of the antients, and earlier moderns, which is ably supported by Braun and Ernesti, namely, the *Holy Spirit*, the *third person of the sacred Trinity*, “per quem (says Ernesti) gratia per Christum parta, nobis obsignatur, dum ipse Spiritus Sanctus in nobis fidem gignit, alit et conservat.” (See also Braun.) It may be observed, that as in the former clause we have Jesus Christ a *person*, so here we have the Holy Spirit also a *person*. Finally, I cannot think that apostacy *alone* is here meant, or (as Doddr. supposes) the sin against the Holy Ghost; but all *wilful sin*, and a presumptuously corrupt life; since such must (as Diodati suggests) *tend* to that dreadful conclusion.

30. οἶδαμεν γὰρ—Κύριος. The οἶδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα *may* be a sort of formula of citation; though very spirited. But I prefer, with Grot. and Ernesti,

to regard the *οἶδαμεν* as strongly emphatical, i. e. (as Grot. explains) “*cogitemus quis et quantus*,” &c. or (as Ern.) “*novimus enim quantam vim ad ulciscendum et puniendum habeat, quàm acer, quàm potius*,” &c. So also Dind. The words are from Deut. 32, 35. *לִינֶקָם וְשָׁלֹם*, “to me is vengeance and retribution.” But the Apostle’s language is founded partly on the Hebrew and partly on the Sept.; unless perhaps *that* might be different from what it now is. *Κρινεῖ* is by some antients and moderns rendered, “*avenge his people*.” (See Theoph., Est., Grot., and Rosenm.) By others, as Menoch., Calvin, Dind., and Wolf, “*will condemn and punish* :” which the Jews fancied the Almighty would never do to the *Israelites*. But I prefer the more extensive sense, *judge*. And so Beza and Braun. By *his people* is meant his *Church*, consisting of good and bad, to each of whom he will “render according to his works.”

31. *Φοβερὸν—ζῶντος*, “A horrible thing it is to fall into the hands of the eternal God.” So Cicero: “*Horribile est causam capitis dicere*.” By *hands* is meant *power*; and the context requires us to add, “for punishment.” The *ζῶντος* may mean *eternal*, or *omnipotent*; or both; both being suggested by the context; since to fall into the *power*, for *punishment*, of a Being at once omnipotent and eternal, is indeed HORRIBLE.

32. *ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε—παθημάτων*. Novo argumento excitat illos Christianos, ut constantes esse in religione pergant, hoc nempe: eos hactenus jam varii generis calamitates sustinuisse; stolidè igitur agere eos, qui post tantas calamitates fortiter superatas, nunc demum deficiant. (Rosenm.) The use of the adverb for the adjective (as here *πρότερον* for *πρότερος*) is found in the best writers. Carpz. cites Philo 972. And he might have added, that it is *common* in *Thucydides*. *Φωτισθέντες*, “after having been enlightened (by the Gospel),” i. e. converted to the true religion. Dind. compares Theophyl.: *κηρύξας—τοὺς πρὸς τῷ μεσημβρινῷ κλίματι ἐφώτισεν*.

32. *πολλὴν ἄβλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων*, “ye en-

dured a great conflict of sufferings." Here there is an agonistical metaphor, as in ἀγωνίζεσθαι, Col. 1, 29. So the Syr. uses the Greek word ἀγών. See Grot., who adds, that by the term παθήματα are meant afflictions of every kind; as Rom. 8, 18. 2 Cor. 1, 6 and 7. Phil. 3, 10, &c. The term too is well illustrated by Bos. Obs. Misc. p. 92. I would add Thucyd. 2, 45. παῖσι δι'—ἡ ἀδελφοῖς ὁρῶ μέγαν τὸν ἀγῶνα.

33. τοῦτο μὲν—θεατριζόμενοι. This partitive use of τοῦτο μὲν τοῦτο δὲ is common in the Classical writers. See Wets., Kypke, and Munthe. Ὀνειδισμοῖς καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι. This is a continuation of the agonistical metaphor, with an allusion to the ἀγών maintained with beasts by miserable wretches, thus θεατριζόμενοι, exposed to the gaze of the multitude assembled at the theatre, who to brutality added contumely; for as Tacit. Annal. 15. (cited by Carpz.) says (with a reference to the Christians), "Pereuntibus addita ludibria." See also Sueton, Juvenal, and other writers referred to by Carpz. That capital punishments were often inflicted in the theatres, he proves from Philo 977 B. See the whole of his very interesting note.

33. τοῦτο δὲ—γενηθέντες, "and partly since ye were made partakers in the persecutions of those that were so circumstanced, namely, by sympathy and consolation, and partly by assisting them. In ἀναστρεφόμενων Kypke and Carpz. recognize a continuation of the metaphor. (See their notes.) It, however, seems best, with the Syr., Casaub., Grot., and Erasm., to suppose it said of those so treated. The recent Commentators, Dind., Rosenm., and Heinr., take the term to here signify *vivere*. But that yields a feeble sense; and the harshness which they complain of is fancied, or may be imputed to the bold character of this very metaphorical sentence.

34. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς—συνεπαθήσατε. This seems meant to be exegetical of the preceding, and to illustrate the *mode* in which this κοινωνία was ministered. The

sense is: "You had (*for instance*—*γὰρ* having here, as often, the sense of *exempli gratia*) sympathy with (me in) my bonds;" namely, at Jerusalem. See Acts 21, 22. seq. Some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, however, read *τοῖς δεσμοῖς*. And this is preferred by Grot., Hamm., Le Clerc, Mill, Bengel, Whitby, Pierce, Morus, Storr., Heinr., and Dind. But I cannot help thinking with Wolf, Carpz., Mich., Noesselt, Matthæi, and Mackn., that the *common* reading is the more genuine. I cannot enter at large into the *reasons*; but I will only observe that the MSS. are very few, and for the most part interpolated and emended. The common reading is also the more *difficult* one; and as to the charge brought against it, that it was devised for the purpose of proving Paul to be the author of the Epistle, there is not a shadow of evidence; nor is it likely that such a paradiorthosis could occupy nearly all the MSS. There is greater probability that the more difficult reading *δεσμοῖς* would pass into the easier *δεσμίους*; which would, of course, eject the *μου*—*καὶ τὴν ἀρπάγην*—*προσδέξασθε*, and "ye joyfully met, received, and endured the ravage and spoil of your property." These were outrages doubtless arising from the unbounded license of the mob, when under the influence of avarice, whetted by superstition; though too often worked upon by the higher powers.

On the *μετὰ χαρᾶς* the Commentators refer to Acts 5, 41. Matt. 5, 12. and James 1, 2. The use here of *προσδ.* is rare; nor are the examples of *רצו*, Job. 33, 20. quite apposite.

34. *γινωσκόντες*—*μένουσαν*. The *ἐν* is omitted in many MSS. of various recensions, Versions, and Fathers, and seems to have arisen from the *εἰν* preceding. Certainly the *ἐαυτοῖς* makes a better sense without it, being a *dativus commodi*. "Ὑπαρξιν, *substance, wealth*. The term often occurs in the Sept., and is also found in Acts 2, 45. *κτῆματα καὶ ὑπάρξεις*, where see the note. "Ἐχειν. By *have*, Grot. ob-

serves, is here meant, have a claim to or title to any thing. Καὶ μένουσαν, “and a durable one;” as Matt. 6, 20. 19, 21. Mark 10, 21. Luke 12, 33. Prov. 8, 18. (cited by Grot.) The words ἐν οὐρανοῖς are by many Critics supposed to have come from the margin. But it is more probable that in the three MSS. in which they are omitted (and which are all full of emendations) they were thrown out, as disfiguring the beauty of the sentence.

35. μὴ ἀποβάλητε—μεγάλην. Παρρησία in this Epistle often signifies constancy in the profession of religion. (Ern. and Carpz.) Or rather, *confidence, fortitude*. In ἀποβ. Carpz., Rosenm., and Dindorf recognize a metaphor taken from soldiers who (like Horace) throw away their shields. And they compare the expression *shield of faith* at Eph. 6, 16. ἔχει, “carries with it.” Μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην, “a great remuneration;” namely, the ὑπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

36. ὑπομονῆς—ἐπαγγελίαν. The γὰρ refers to a clause omitted; q. d. “(And well may I enjoin on you the cultivation of this παρρησία) for ye have need of patience and constancy.” ἵνα τὸ θέλημα—ἐπαγγελία, “so that (i. e. if ye would expect this) after having done and accomplished the will of God, ye may obtain the promised salvation.” By the θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant what God would have done, or suffered: and it has reference to all the duties, whether of *doing*, or *suffering*, which the circumstances in which we are placed may impose upon us. See Ernesti. The Commentators, it may be observed, usually limit the sense too much.

37, 38. ἔτι γὰρ—χρονιεί. The μικρὸν ὅσον signifies *a very little while*. To the examples of the Philologists I add Max. Tyr. D. 24, 6. and 1, 469. σμικρὸν ὅσον, (where see Markl.) and Polyæn. 8, 10, 711. ἐπὶ πλείστον ὅσον, *a considerable time*. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος (*he that is to come*) was, as we find from the Gospels, an usual title of the Messiah. See Whitby. The passage introduced is taken from Hab. 2, 3 and

4. It is thought the the Apostle *accommodates* the language of the Prophet to his own times, and that he inserts the two clauses for the sake of the conclusion. See Mackn. Between the words of St. Paul and those both of the Hebrew and the Sept. (though the *latter* is chiefly adhered to, for the sake of the conclusion,) there is a remarkable discrepancy. Some propose emendations of the Hebrew text; while others (as Pococke) maintain that the text as it stands is susceptible of the sense of the Sept. See more in Mackn. and Slade.

“Ἡξεί. This has in the Hebr. צב צב, “he will surely come.” Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. Also cited in Rom. 1, 17. and Gal. 3, 11. The sense here seems to be: “The just, because of his implicit faith, shall obtain salvation.” See the learned note of Ernesti. Καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείλῃται—αὐτῷ, “But if any one draw back, give way to fear, (so Hesych. explains, φοβείται. See Gal. 2, 12.), and either apostatize, or compromise his principles, or, through failing in his expectations, cease to act up to the duties of a Christian,” Οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ, “my soul shall have no pleasure in him,” i. e. he shall be exposed to my displeasure. A litotes.

39. Ἡμεῖς—ψυχῆς. The Apostle (Theophyl. observes) softens the harshness of the οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ, &c. by a sentiment expressive of confidence in their firmness and constancy, which must have been gratifying. With respect to the words themselves, they are somewhat obscure, from the dense brevity of the phraseology; but the context will guide us to their meaning. Thus ὑποστολῆς, as is plain from the preceding ὑποστείλῃται and the antithetical πίστεως, stands for *drawing back*, and *timidity*; Carpz. rightly subauds τέκνα or υἱοὶ. It is an Hebrew mode of expression, denoting *timidity* and *doubt*. The εἰς ἀπωλείαν, and εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς show the result and tendency of each kind of conduct. By the περιποίησις is denoted, not the *possession* (as recent Commentators explain), but the *gaining* or *saving* of the soul. So Ernesti,

“ut animam lucremur, æternam salutem consequamur, servemur.” And so Theophyl., who paraphrases thus: Ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμεν τῶν ἀπολλυμένων διὰ τὸ ὑποστέλλεσθαι καὶ ἀπορρᾶθύμειν ἢ διστάζειν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πίστει βεβαίων, ὥστε περιποιῆσαι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς, τουτέστι, κτήσασθαι, φύλαξαι, καὶ σῶσαι.

CHAP. XI.

VER. 1. From the mention of *faith*, the Apostle takes occasion to describe its nature and efficacy. The δὲ has therefore a transitive force, and may be rendered *now*. I would paraphrase: “Now faith (such as that I have mentioned, and by which the just shall live) is a firm expectation and confident persuasion of the existence of things not yet seen.” Ὑπόστασις is from ὑφίστασθαι, to firmly *consist*, and *subsist*. So the antients and earlier moderns render, the *substance*, οὐσία or οὐσίωσις, i. e. that which makes them subsist and *be*. But this interpretation, Ernesti observes, yields scarcely a pertinent sense. And as ὑφίστασθαι, in the later Greek writers, frequently signifies *existimare*, he, in common with most recent Commentators, explains it *firma expectatio*; as supra 3, 14. Others of the earlier and later moderns explain it *base, foundation*. But this sense seems not suitable here. See the notes of Grot., Carpz., and Elsner.

Ἐλεγχος usually signifies a *demonstration*. And so it is here explained by Theophyl.: δεῖξις, φανέρωσις. Carpz. explains, *demonstrata cognitio*. Dind. (more properly) *documentum*, that being the signification in familiar phraseology. Rosenm. interprets it, *firm and undoubted conviction*. And so Luther, and (nearly) Doddr., and also Hallet ap. Doddr., who explains: “Such a kind of reason and argument, as both convinces the understanding, and *engages* a man to *act* according to that conviction.” It is, however, easier to perceive the general meaning of the Apostle than to determine the exact sense of each term; since the sentence is worded *populariter*, and not with philosophical accuracy; and in this and the whole of what follows may plainly be recognised the ardent spirit of the Apostle, which does not descend to petty niceties. In both the above terms we are to understand that which *causes* the thing to be. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) annotates thus: οἷον ἡ ἀνάστασις οὕτω ὑφέστηκεν, ἀλλ’ ἡ πίστις ὑφιστά αὐτήν, καὶ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τίθησι. And on ἔλεγχος he observes: ποιεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα βλέπεσθαι τῷ ἡμῶν ὡς παρόντα. See the admirable exposition of Chrys., as translated by Dr. Hales ap. Valpy.

By the *faith* now about to be treated on, and which respects things past as well as future, is (as the best Commentators say) to be understood a *general* faith and belief in the sayings and promises of God. For by the examples the Apostle brings forward of au-

tient times, it is plain he does not actually treat of faith in Christ; though from the former, as a *genus*, proceeds the latter as a more excellent *species*, namely, a Gospel faith, which, as being reposed in Christ, does, in fact, rest in God, since whatever Christ said, he said in the name of God. See Ern., Carpz., Dind., and Rosenm.

2. ἐν ταύτῃ—πρεσβύτεροι, “On account of (2) this faith our ancestors were accounted praise-worthy.” The πρεσβ., like *veteres*, πατέρες, signifies *ancestors*, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and others, of whom some are then mentioned. Μαρτυρεῖν τινι signifies to *bear witness to*, and is almost always used in a good sense for *to praise*. See Schleus. Lex. The antients, and early moderns, supply a *Deo*; the recent ones, *ab hominibus*. But both may be united. The ἐν, like the Hebr. 2, and διὰ, signifies *propter, on account of*. So Beza, Pisc., Rosenm., and Dind.

3. πίστει νοοῦμεν—γεγονέναι. Πίστις, Dind. observes, here signifies a full persuasion that the things recorded in the Old Testament are true. For now the Apostle employs the term in its more extensive sense; and then proceeds to use it in its limited one.” The words may be rendered: “by faith it is that we understand the universe κατηγίσθαι ῥήματι Θεοῦ, was created at the fiat of God’s will.” Καταρτίζειν signifies properly to repair, make whole what is broken, torn, or disordered: and thus it is in the Sept. and in the present passage used of the *creation* of the universe; since that carries with it a notion of *adjusting, digesting, &c.*, which is very applicable to the chaos “without form and void,” out of which the world was created. The ῥήματι Θεοῦ (i. e. the *fiat*) has reference to the sublime passage of Gen. 1, 3. And so elsewhere it is said: “He spake the word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created.”

3. εἰς τὸ μὴ—γεγονέναι. These words present some difficulty: but the best Commentators from Heins. to Rosenm. have seen that εἰς τὸ is for ὥστε; and the μὴ is to be referred to φαινομένων; a transposition (as Heinr. observes) usual to the Hellenists. (See Raphel.) So 2 Macc. 7, 28. ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν

αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός. The sentiment is thus explained by Rosenm.: “That the whole visible world was created by the sole will of God, we learn by faith; for that creation does not come under our view, as being long past. *Now* we see trees arise from trees, animals generated from animals, and men from men. But the first trees, animals, and men had not their origin from such as now exist, and are seen. This is therefore said, that we may the more readily believe that God can produce what we do *not* see.

4. πίστει πλείονα—Θεῷ, “By the virtue of faith Abel offered up a better and more acceptable sacrifice to God than Cain.” So Chrys. explains the πλείονα by ἐντιμωτέραν. Braun compares the Hebr. יִתֵּר. And so in Matt. 6, 25. 12, 41. Παρὰ Κάιν is put populariter for παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Κάιν, as it is *expressed* by the Syr. Now the offering was *better* and *more acceptable*, as proceeding from faith. The nature of this faith, and in what it differed from that of Cain, is admirably shown and illustrated by Abp. Magee on the Atonement, Illust. No. 64 & 65., whom see, or the extracts in Slade and Valpy. See also Mackn. and Hallet, by them cited, and other writers referred to.

4. δι’ ἧς—αὐτοῦ, “on account of which sacrifice he was borne testimony to (by God) that he was righteous,” i. e. pious and virtuous; or, “he obtained from God the praise of piety.” Thus he is called by Philo δίκαιος; as he is also in Matt. 23, 35. He may indeed be so called κατ’ ἐξοχὴν, as being the first and most eminent example of it. The words μαρτυροῦντος—Θεοῦ are (I think) exegetical of the δι’ ἧς, &c. The sense is: “God himself bearing testimony to his offerings, that they were just;” which implies *approbation* of them. On the nature of, and the mode in which this approbation was signified, we are left in the dark; and the Commentators, of course, abound in conjectures, which (and especially the speculations of the recent foreign Commentators) I shall not detail. I cannot but suspect (though it

seems to have occurred to none of the interpreters) that the Apostle was well informed on this point, and supposed his *readers* to be so, and that by *tradition*. By tradition, too, Theodot., in rendering Gen. 4, 4. καὶ ἐπέιδεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβὲλ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δαύροις αὐτοῦ has ἐνεπύρισε for ἐπέιδεν. I suspect that some copies had ἐπέιδεν—αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνεπύρισε, from *tradition*, doubtless, yet deserving of high credit, as not resting merely on *oral* testimony, but probably recorded in those antient writings found in the antiquities of the Hebrew nation, of which Josephus often makes mention, and which he used in forming his celebrated history. Besides, this is supported by the mode in which God usually signified his approbation. Fire from heaven, it seems, consumed the flesh of the “choice firstlings” sacrificed by Abel; while Cain’s “fruits of the ground” remained untouched. Finally, we may very well believe in, what (as Grot. tells us, on the passage of Genes.) even *Julian credited*.

Καὶ δι’ αὐτῆς, “and by that faith and righteousness so evinced.” For such, I agree with the antients, seems to be meant by the ἡς, at which the moderns stumble. In the readings λαλεῖται and λαλεῖ the Commentators are at issue. The most eminent Critics agree in preferring λαλεῖ, though resting only on the authority of a few very antient MSS., the Syriac and Coptic Versions, and some antient Fathers. And certainly, if λαλεῖται cannot (as Valckn. seems to have proved) be taken in a middle or deponent sense, that reading deserves the preference, as yielding a sense far worthier of the Apostle: for the other can only signify, “is spoken of;” which, as Dind. remarks, is a *third* (and frigid) repetition of the same thing; while, according to the one in question, the sense will be as follows: “though now dead, his faith and righteousness speak with a loud voice, and call upon us to imitate his example.” See 12, 4. That even the dead may *figuratively* be said to *speak*, no critic can doubt;

since even *inanimate* things are said to speak. See Rosenm., who cites the passage of Virgil, where of the punishment of Phlegyas it is said: “*magnâ testatur voce per umbras, Discite justitiam moniti.*”

5. *πίσται* Ἐνώχ—Θεῶ. This is called, by Mr. Slade, a commentary upon the elliptical expression in Gen. 5, 24., where it is said of Enoch, he “was not; for God took him.” Most of the recent Commentators, however, as Dind., Rosenm., and Mich., regard it as founded in *error*. “For (say they) in the passage of Genesis we find not but that Enoch *died*; and nothing is said to define how he was translated, whether alive or dead. The formula, God לקח, &c., cannot of itself signify, God removed him *alive*; nor can οὐχ εὕρισκετο and אֵינְנו signify any more than “he ceased to be.” But to this I must demur. Will these moderns pretend to be better judges of the force of Hebrew phraseology than the antient Hebrew Interpreters *themselves*, who, from the earliest ages downwards, have interpreted the words of removal *alive*? i. e. the being, as we say, *translated*. As far as the Sept. Version goes, the position is manifestly false; for its language evidently conveys the idea of a *translation*; they render the לקח by Θεὸς αὐτὸν μετέθηκεν, which *determines* the point; and the אֵינְנו, by οὐκ εὕρισκετο; which goes very *far* to determine it. And the same will apply to Sirach 49, 14. This *translation*, too, is evidently supported by Josephus and Philo. But what reason (it may be asked) had the authors of the Sept. Version and the Jewish Interpreters for supposing this *translation*? Because (it may be answered) there really is something very peculiar and mysterious in the expression. For (as Whitby observes) of *all* the rest it is said, that *they died*; but of him this is not said, but only that אֵינְנו, *he was not, for God took him*. Neither is this said any where else in the Mosaic writings. Suppose, indeed, the expressions אֵינְנו and לקח are doubtful;

yet the context,* and the circumstances of the case, lead to the interpretation invariably adopted by the antients, and *confirmed* by its being adopted by the inspired writer.†

With respect to the *mode* in which the translation was effected, of that we are not informed: but it seems a probable conjecture of Mackn. and others, that the body of Enoch (as also that of Elijah) was fitted for its new state by that sort of change which the bodies of the righteous who are alive at the day of judgment will go through. With the notions of the Rabbins (which may be seen in Whitby) we have nothing to do.

6. χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως—γίνεται. The phrase εὐαρεστέιν τινι signifies to do what is *pleasing* to any one; and, as applied to *God*, it must denote faith in his existence, and obedience to his will, whether as revealed in Scripture, or in the book of nature.

The words πιστεῦσαι—γίνεται are exegetical of the preceding; and the sense seems to be simply this: “There can be no worshipping of God without a firm belief in his existence, and that He will reward those who study to do his will.” For faith in his existence must *precede* worship of him; and who would worship a Being who remained an unconcerned spectator of what passes on the earth, and with whom is no retribution? Such seems to be all

* For the εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνώχ τῷ Θεῷ immediately preceding, plainly indicates the *cause*; as is suggested by St. Paul in the words πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ μαρτυρήσεται εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ. To understand *death* would be frigid.

† Thus it appears that it is not correct to call the words of St. Paul (adopted from the Sept.) a *commentary* on the Hebrew; and still less an *accommodation of Jewish opinions*; as do Dind. and Rosenm. As to the opinion of early ages, of which Dind. makes mention, that pious or great persons were supposed to be removed from the world without death, with this we have nothing to do. For the stories of Hercules, Semiramis, and Romulus (to which they advert), were, of course, mere impostures; though formed probably on the traditional account, in the early nations, of this *translation* of the Patriarch Enoch.

that is meant, and no philosophical refinements are to be sought. The *μισθοδοσία*, Carpzov thinks, includes the punishment to be inflicted on the wicked. And so Theophyl. : Εἰ γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσῃ τις ἀντίδοσιν εἶναι καλῶν καὶ κακῶν, οὐκ ἂν εὐαρεστήσῃ. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν τὴν ἐπίπονον τῆς ἀρετῆς ὁδὸν βαδίσῃ, μὴ πεισθεὶς εἶναι ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι πολλαπλασίας καὶ μονιμωτέρας τὰς ἀμοιβάς ;

The *ἀδύνατον* must be taken, populariter, for, “it is impossible to suppose.” It is plain that *ἐκζητεῖν* is here used, like the Heb. שׁוּרַר and שׁוּרַב, of an *earnest endeavour* to do the will of God. On the sentiment that God is a rewarder of his faithful servants, Grot., Wets., &c. adduce a vast number of Classical passages.

7. *πίστει χρηματισθεὶς* Νῶε—αὐτοῦ. The term *χρηματίζεσθαι* is often, as here, used of having a divine revelation, or being divinely inspired. So Theophyl. : Σημειῶσαι δὲ, ὅτι χρηματίζει Θεὸς, χρηματίζει καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα· κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον περὶ τοῦ Συμέων. Ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. Θεὸς ἄρα τὸ Πνεῦμα.

7. *περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων*, “concerning things not yet seen, but only to be viewed by the eye of faith.” There is a reference to ver. 1. *πίστις ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπόμενων*. Now *the things unseen* were the *deluge* and the events accompanying it.

7. *εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κιβωτὸν*. The *εὐλαβ.* is by some moderns, as Grot., Vatab., Schmid, and Schleus., taken to signify “*metu diluvii*.” And so the Vulg. and Theophyl. But that sense seems inconsistent with the *faith* ascribed to him ; though it might admit of modification. I prefer, with most moderns, as Ernesti, Rosenm., and Carpzov, &c. to take *εὐλαβ.* of *religious reverence* in respect to the oracle. *Κιβωτὸν*. This word, like *כֶּבֶת*, signifies *chest* ; but might very well be applied to *ships* of a square form. Many learned moderns have, however, supposed that the ark was of a *round* form, as better adapted to resist the waves. And that, indeed, seems to have been a very antient form ; since in Thucydides we have perpetual mention of round

ships; and we are told that the Corinthians first made long ships, or triremes. The above Critics found their opinion on the ark being called πλοῖον by Berosus ap. Joseph. But that is no proof at all. And common sense may show how improbable it were that the *first* attempts at ship-building should produce a *round* ship: a form which requires a degree of science and skill such as we cannot suppose Noah to have possessed; especially, too, when we consider the *immense size* of the ark, larger than a first-rate ship of the line. Besides, the opinion in question is directly at variance with the Mosaic account, which shows it to have been quite oblong, 300 by 50; though there is nothing there said to compel us to suppose a *square*, and we *may* suppose the corners to have been rounded off, very much after the manner of the Chinese *junks*, which, in a country where nothing changes, may be supposed of the very form of the most antient ships, and *those* would probably be made after the model of the ark.

Δι' ἧς, i. e. (as Erasm., Rosenm., Grot., and Beza explain) “by the building of which ark.” Rather, “by which *faith*.” Κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον. For (as Grot. observes) any one is said to condemn others who, by his own deeds, shows what others ought to have done; and thus convicts them of blame for not having so done; as Matt. 12, 41 & 42. See Theoph. By δικαιοσύνης is meant the *reward* of righteousness; as *sin* is sometimes put for the *punishment* of sin.

8. πίστει καλούμενος—ἔρχεται. Construe πίστει with ὑπήκουσε; and before ἐξελθεῖν subaud ὥστε, or εἰς τὸ. Ernesti observes that καλεῖν is used of the offer of any divine benefits; and κλησις, in the New Testament, signifies not only what God has *offered*, but what he has *given*. Eis κληρονομίαν, “for a possession for himself and posterity.” The μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται Rosenm. renders, “nesciebat, quæ et qualis erat illa terra.” The truth is, this seems a popular mode of expression, such as is not uncommon; and Abraham probably was by no means ig-

norant of the country, or its productions; but went without knowing whither he was going, as not knowing *where* it would please God he should settle in the land. So Theophyl.: οὐδὲ ᾗδει, τις ἐστὶν ἡ γῆ ὅλως ἐκείνη εἰς ἣν καλεῖται.

9. πίστει παρώκησεν—αὐτῆς. The εἰς τὴν γῆν is for ἐν τῇ γῇ. And τῆς ἐπαγγελίας is a genitive of the substantive, for the cognate adjective, or participle. Παρώκησε is πάροικος ἦν, i. e. ἀλλογενὴς, *sojourner*, in opposition to an ἐπιγενής. As a proof of which he even had to purchase the cave of Machpelah as a burying-place for his family. In illustration of his being a sojourner, it is added ἐν σκήναις κατοικήσας, “dwelling in tents;” which we may suppose would be the case, since the building of a house implies a property in the land (see Grot.); whereas setting up a tent by no means does this.*

9. μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ. This is strangely rendered, in the E. V. and other Versions (see Doddr. and Mackn.), *with*, &c. The true force of the expression (which seems to be Hebraic) was well seen by the antients. Thus Theophyl. explains: καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Ἰακώβ οὕτω ταύτην κατώκησαν ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν. And so J. Capell. and Grot., who observe that it denotes parity and *mode*; q. d. “as did also Isaac and Jacob after them, to whom the same promise belonged.” See Grot. It seems meant to be implied: “and yet they, too, had faith in the promises.” See Theophyl.

10. ἐξεδέχετο—ὁ Θεός. These words illustrate the *nature* of that faith so conspicuous in all Abraham’s peregrinations. The sense is: “He bore his peregrinations under the hope of the city that hath *solid* foundations,” as opposed to the ταῖς σκήναις at ver. 9. Now by this is doubtless meant, not *Jerusalem* (as

* And in those early periods, when population was very thin, even foreigners seem to have been allowed to *fix tents*, and bring cattle to graze where the land was not occupied by the natives. Something after the manner of what are called the *squatters*, in the back settlements of America.

some Commentators suppose), even in the literal sense, but (as appears from ver. 16. compared with 13 & 14.) the heavenly city, heaven. So Theophyl.: ἐξεδέχοντο τὴν οὐράνιον πόλιν, ἥτις ἀληθινὸς ἔχει θεμελίου, αἰὲ ἐστώτας, καὶ μηδέποτε σαθρουμένους. And so Grot., Le Clerc, and Rosenm. Dind. and Heinr. lose themselves in speculation. Ἡς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός. It is observed, by Chrys., that God, though the τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς of the whole universe, is especially said so of the *heavenly* city, since in heaven chiefly shines forth the majesty of the Divine wisdom and power.

11. πίστει καὶ αὐτῇ—ἔλαβε.

On this passage the recent Foreign Commentators stumble exceedingly; and afford a notable specimen both of their *delicacy* and their *judgment*. Questions of the sort they enter into are more fitted for a work on surgery and midwifery than the exposition of the word of God on so deeply serious a subject as that of the preternatural conception of the *mother of the faithful*. We will therefore leave their discussions in *medio*, which certainly cannot be applicable in the present case, since *miraculous* power was exerted upon Sarah as well as Abraham. Thus it is said, Gen. 21, 1. "And the Lord visited Sarah." It is strange, then, that the recent Commentators should almost invariably adopt the conjecture of Michaelis, viz. for αὐτῇ Σάρρα to read αὐτῇ Σάρρα. For, not to mention the harshness of the two Datives, αὐτῇ Σάρρα, just after another Dative, the occurrence of αὐτῇ is sufficient to condemn this conjecture; since, in the sense thus arising, αὐτῇ could have had no place. Besides, as Grot. observes, from the examples of *men*, the Apostle passes to *women*, that he may excite those of both sexes to the virtue of faith. But why, then (it may be asked) did those Critics unanimously adopt that conjecture? Because, forsooth, the καταβολὴν σπέρματος is not accordant with physical precision. What, then, is nothing to be allowed for the delicacy of the sacred writer? but he must express himself with the physical accuracy of an Hippocrates? I shall not enter further into particulars; but only observe that the obscurity solely arose from *delicacy*; and that the true force of the words is that which was laid down by Chrys. p. 548, 15. (adduced by that writer in a *Homily* on this Epistle) εἰς τὸ κατασχεῖν τὸ σπέρμα; εἰς ὑποδοχὴν δυνάμιν ἔλαβεν ἡ νεκρωμένη, καὶ ἡ στεῖρα, for she was both *barren* as well as *old*. And so Theophyl.: ἐνεδυναμώθη εἰς τὸ ὑποδέξασθαι καὶ κρατῆσαι τὸ καταβληθὲν εἰς αὐτὴν σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ. I am gratified to find that the above mode of interpretation has the support of the acute Heinr. and the learned Dindorf.

I must not omit to observe that many Critics would, on the authority of some three MSS. and the Vulg., omit ἔτεκεν; but (I

think) on very insufficient grounds. For it seems plain that the omission was purely from conjecture and *emendation*: and the MSS. are such as are full of corrections; nay, Ernesti observes, there is reason to suppose that the Codex Alexandrinus was occasionally altered from the Vulg.

11. ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον, “since she had judged him faithful and veracious who had promised.”

12. διὸ καὶ—ἀναρίθμητος. It is well observed, by Grot. and Rosenm., that the δὲ must be referred to both Abraham and Sarah, i. e. the *faith* of both. At αὐ’ ἐνὸς some subaud αἵματος or σπέρματος, as of Abraham and Sarah. But I prefer, with Zeger, Camer., Rosenm., Ern., &c., σώματος, which Grot. and most Critics understand of *Abraham*. It seems better, however, with Chrys., Theophyl., and others, to refer it to *Sarah*. Which, too, appears to be more agreeable to what precedes: and the Apostle himself, at Rom. 4, 19., speaking of the faith of Abraham, says: οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νεκρωμένον καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μητέρας Σάρρας.

Καὶ ταῦτα, *et quidem, and that*. The force of the νεκρωμένου requires no explanation. The phrases καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα, &c. are plainly Oriental and popular hyperboles, yet sometimes found in the *Western* writers. Out of several examples I have collected I select the following. Aristoph. Lysistr. 1260. ἦν γὰρ τῶνδρες οὐκ ἐλάσσως τὰς ψάμμας, τοὶ Πέρσαι.

13. κατὰ πίστιν—ἀσπασάμενοι. It was believed by the Patriarchs, that though *they* could not see the actual fulfilment of the Divine promises, yet these would certainly be fulfilled in their descendants. They may, however, be supposed to have discerned the *commencement* of their fulfilment, in having children from whom should arise so numerous a posterity. (Dind.)

At the οὗτοι πάντες Commentators stumble. Grot. and Sykes refer it to all the descendants downwards. But of this opinion Whitby has shown the futility. It must, with Rosenm. and Dind., be understood of those that went before, i. e. (as Chrys. and Theophyl.

limit it) all that *did* die. *Μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, “without having received the promises.” It is plain that these promises were not so much *temporal* as *eternal*. See Whitby, Doddr., Mich., and Abp. Magee, referred to by Slade. *Κατὰ πίστιν*, “with confidence in the promises, both temporal, and eternal.” *Ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες*, “viewing them with the eye of faith.” *Ἀσπασάμενοι*, “embracing with delight.” *Ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι—γῆς*, “seeing and acknowledging that they were strangers and sojourners on *earth*, as they were in the land of *Canaan*.” *Παρεπίδημοι*, *sojourners*. The terms properly signifies one who lives *by* another. See Schleus. Lex.

14, 15. οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα—ἀνακάμψαι. Ἐμφανίζουσιν *plainly show, signify*. Ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσι, *appetunt*, “that they are seeking after and desiring to have a country (either naturally or metaphorically such); which, as long as they remained sojourners, could not be the case. Different from the common principle among the antients, that every place where he can live well is, to a wise man, his country. See the passages of Philo, cited by Carpz. and Wets.

15. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον. It is observed, by Dind., that *μνημονεύειν* indicates the desire and love with which we remember any thing, like the Heb. *זָכַר* in Gen. 8, 1. and Ps. 8, 5. 6, 6. “If, therefore (says Rosenm.) they called themselves strangers, because they were sojourners in Canaan, and accounted Chaldea their *country*, they might have returned thither. Between the departure of Abraham from Chaldea and the death of Jacob, there was *time* for the Patriarchs to have returned thither if they *had* loved it as a country.” If they had *sought* a country (as observes Braun) no one were more desirable than Chaldæa, then far superior in fertility and wealth to Canaan.

16. *νοὺν δέ*, &c. “It is plain, then, that they dwelt only on the promises of God respecting the possession of Canaan, as a *country*, by their *posterity*; as

they did of the attainment by themselves of another country, even a heavenly," εἰς ἣν (says Theophyl.) οὐπω εἶχε καιρὸν ἀναβῆναι. On the sentiment of heaven being man's proper country, numerous passages are cited by Wets. and Carpzov; as Anaxag. ap. Diog. Laert. 2., who, to some one asking οὐδὲν σοι μέλει τῆς πατρίδος; answered: Εὐφήμει, ἐμοὶ γὰρ καὶ σφόδρα μέλει τῆς πατρίδος· δείξας τὸν οὐρανόν. To which I add Plut. Non posse suav. §. 29, 1. οἱ μὲν ἐτέρου βίου τὸν θάνατον ἀρχὴν χρεΐττονος νομίζοντες, ἐὰν τ' ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ὥσπ' μᾶλλον ἡδονταί, μείζονα προσδοκῶντες. Plato: ἄνθρωπος φύτον οὐράνιον, οὐκ ἔγγειον. See also Philo Jud. 196. fin. and Clem. Alex. 71 c.

16. διὸ οὐκ—πόλιν, "Wherefore (because they had this undoubting faith in the Divine promises) God did not disdain to be called *their** God, (and protector and benefactor)." Οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς, "did not disdain, but vouchsafed." The present, Beza and Grot. observe, is for the preterite, *Historiarum more*; as supra, ver. 14. At ἐπικαλεῖσθαι must be understood ὥστε. The ἤτοιμ. is rightly rendered, by Grot. and Rosenm., *destined* (as Matt. 25, 34., where see the note), and these words ἠτοίμασε γὰρ αὐτοὺς πόλιν, they observe, are exegetical of the ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν. By the πόλιν is plainly meant *heaven*.

17, 18. πίστει προσενήνοχεν—ἀναδεξάμενος. Προσφέρω is a sacrificial term, and signifies to bring (πρὸς) to the altar; as James 2, 21. Now this Abraham did; and being prepared to sacrifice his son, he had the same merit of obedience as if he had actually sacrificed him. That this was always considered a full and consummate sacrifice we are told by Philo 374 D.

Πειραζόμενος, "trying his faith, and putting it to the utmost proof." Μονογενῇ, namely, by a lawful wife. (Rosenm.) The second clause of the sentence

* For (as Grot. observes) God was particularly called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and so named by Himself, not only during their life, but after their death. Now the notion of *God* implies also that of favour, protection, and benefit.

is, in some measures a parallelism: for the same circumstance of the offering up is brought forward, with the addition of the τὸν μονογενῆ. And the words οὐ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος seem meant to suggest the *reason* for the offering, namely, that he had received the promises, and admitted them into his heart by faith. For I assent to Grot. and Rosenm. that ἀναδ. is more significant than the simple δεχ. (though it is by some thought to be synonymous with it.) And this appears to be required by the circumstances of the case; for the faith shown by Abraham was the most wonderful instance of this virtue on record; since here (as Theophyl. observes) not only did nature struggle hard, but the word of God wrestled with the Divine order; He who had said, "To thee and thy seed will I give the land," ordering him, "Slay thy son." It is also observed, by Theophyl., that Abraham was tried, not that God wanted a proof of his virtue, but that we might learn that virtue is evinced by experience and in works.

18. πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη, "to whom, or concerning whom," &c. These words are meant to set forth the implicit faith of Abraham. The sense is: "That Abraham, to whom it had been said by God: In Isaac shall there be named a posterity to thee." Most recent Commentators, indeed, as Ern., Schmid, and Rosenm., take the κληθ. simply in the sense of *esse*. "For (says Rosenm.) verba nominalia sæpe sunt realia." Thus Ern. renders: "Isaac erit auctor posteritatis tuæ." Dind. and Heinr.: "will be called forth, arise, and be born." But this would require ἐκκληθ. I would therefore acquiesce in the first detailed interpretation, or take κλη. as a sort of vox prægnans for, "shall be and become famous." And so, nearly, Grot.

19. λογισάμενος ὅτι—ὁ Θεός. This shows the reason why Abraham, though the promise of posterity by Isaac seemed precise, yet did not hesitate to offer up his son. (Dind.)

Λογισάμενος is to be referred to προσενήνοχεν. Re-

flecting that, though Isaac should die, yet the promise of posterity by him would be sure, inasmuch as the same omnipotence that at first brought him into being could even raise him from the dead." Such seems to be the meaning of the passage; though it must be confessed that it is no easy matter to determine the sense of the clause ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο, of which *four* interpretations have been proposed. Some, as J. Capell., Grot., Heins., Calvin, Scaliger, Wolf, Warburton, Sykes, and Stebbing, think it is meant that the whole transaction was parabolical, or typical of the method God would pursue for the salvation of men. And this is supported by the antients; and *may* possibly be the true interpretation. Yet it seems somewhat harsh and arbitrary. See Ern. and Dind. 2. Hamm., our Translators, Whitby, and Doddr., assign the sense: "from whence also he had (originally) received him figuratively, namely, from his own dead body and the dead womb of Sarah." See Rom. 4, 19, 3. Grot., Capell., Heins., Calvin, Scaliger, and Rosenm., interpret: "from whence also, by a sort of image of the resurrection, he received him from the dead." Thus ἐκ νεκρῶν will be repeated. For (they observe) Isaac was, in a manner, dead, in his father's opinion and his own; and he was restored to him, as it were, from the gates of the grave. A comparison found elsewhere; as 2 Cor. 1, 9 & 10. 4 Cam., Raphel, Krebs, Dind., and Schleus., take ἐν παραβολῇ for παραβολῶς; adducing some examples of παραβολῶς from Joseph. and other writers. And, indeed, it frequently occurs in the *Classical* authors; but not in *Scripture*, and ἐν παραβολῇ *no where*. Now as few interpretations of the New Testament, resting solely on Classical usage, are well founded, so neither, I think, is this. See the details in Dind. Of the three former any one may be the true; though I think the *second*, as being the simplest and most natural, deserves the preference.

20. πίστει—Ἡσαῦ. At περὶ μελλόντων subaud

προφητεύων. Or the words may connect with πίστει, i. e. "faith respecting things future," or "because he had believed in God that great and glorious things would come to pass in his posterity." See Gen. 26, 4. (Rosenm.) Πίστει, "in faith and sure confidence," namely, that his blessing would be effectual. And though it turned out different from his expectation, yet that proves that his blessing was delivered in faith. See Whitby and Mackn., or Slade.

21 πίστει Ἰακώβ—αὐτοῦ,

"In faith that his blessing would be effectual;" doubtless from the inspiration with which he was favoured. Καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. The Hebrew word corresponding to ῥάβδος may, according to its pointing, either signify a *staff*, or a *bed's head*. The former interpretation may be justified (see Doddr. and Mackn.); but the best critics prefer the latter. The bed, I should conceive, was like what we call a Grecian *sopha*; and the πῦμα (literally, *the leaning-place*) was doubtless the wreath, or head of the *sopha*, to which, therefore, Jacob, in aiming at a kneeling or prostrate posture, would be turned, and lean. From a comparison, however, with the passage of Genes. it appears that this circumstance took place a little *before*, namely, when he had received the promise that he should be buried in the land of Canaan; and this, therefore, the Commentators take to have been an act of worship to God in token of thankfulness for such a privilege as being buried in the land of Canaan. To remove the apparent discrepancy, Mr. Slade conjectures that the Apostle intended the clauses of this verse to be independent of each other ("By faith he blessed—and, on another occasion, worshipped," &c.), thus disregarding the order of time. This I think far more probable than the method proposed by Ernesti, which is too bold, and it is, I have no doubt, the *very truth*. Such an anachronism is indeed so trifling as to present no real difficulty. For I cannot agree with Mackn. and others, that when the oath was made to him, Israel was not sick in bed; and that his falling sick took place *some time after*. Now μετὰ ταῦτα often (as in the Gospels) denotes a *short* space of time. And the expressions, *the time drew nigh*, and, *thou shalt bury me*, plainly indicate *sickness*, though incipient, yet probably mortal. So in the next verse we have: τελευτῶν—ἐνετείλατο. Besides, the ἤλη and ἐνοχλεῖται ἀρρώστια of Gen. 48, 2., may very well be understood of *severe sickness*. This being the case, I cannot but regard the προσκύνησις of Israel on having received his son's promise concerning his burial, as an act of devout thankfulness to God for his protection throughout life; conceiving himself now to have, in a manner, done with this world. And this (I imagine) caused the Apostle to unite it so closely with the solemn blessing of his sons,

which took place, doubtless, a very short time after; for the sickness of such very aged persons never lasts long; since, as Sophocles beautifully observes, *Œd. Tyr.* 961. *σμικρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εὐνάζει ῥοπή.*

Thus all difficulty will vanish, and every thing be natural and consistent.

22. *πίστει Ἰωσήφ—ἐνετείλατο, when dying* (as before *ἀποθνήσκων*), *being shortly to die.* The *ἐμνημόνευσε* evidently designates a prophetical annunciation; but whether by inspiration at the time, or before, is not clear; yet, from a comparison with the case of Jacob, *Gen.* 47., the *latter* (which is supported by Capellus and Carpz.) seems the more probable. At all events, he well knew, and declared to his sons, that another country was promised to them, to possess which they would leave Egypt. The direction concerning his bones indicates the same firm faith in the promises of God as that of Jacob.

23. *πίστει Μωϋσῆς, &c.* i. e. faith and reliance on the assistance and blessing of God to their endeavours to save the child. *Πατέρων*, i. e. *parents*, the father and mother. A rare use, and of which the philologists adduce no apposite example. *Διότι εἶδον ἁστέιον τὸ παιδίον.* *Handsome* we know Moses was, which might of itself raise the commiseration of the parents. But probably there was also something *august* in the countenance of the child, which seemed to announce that he was born for great purposes.

23. *καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως.* The sense is: “And (therefore) they did not heed the king’s edict for the exposure and destruction of the children.”

24—26. *πίστει Μωϋσῆς—Φαραώ. Μέγας γενόμενος,* “when he had attained manhood (or rather *maturity*; being forty years old. So *Herod.* 4, 9, 15. *ἐπεὶ γένωνται τρόφεις.* See Schmid and Rosenm.), disdained to be called the adopted son of,” &c. The words following, *μᾶλλον—ἀπόλαυσιν*, place in a strong point of view the merit of the sacrifice: for by re-

nouncing the adoption, he ceased to be an Egyptian, and to have the privileges thereof; and became an Israelite, and was exposed to a participation in the oppressions of his countrymen. The ἡ πρόσκαιρον ἔχειν ἀμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, refers to the luxurious and sinful pleasures of a court at that time the most corrupt in the world. In πρόσκαιρον is contained an indirect contrast between the ever-during promises of God, and the fleeting pleasures of sin. This is further illustrated in the next clause μείζονα—τοῦ Χριστοῦ, where, by a strong figure, the insults and oppressions of the Egyptians are designated by the ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which most Commentators are agreed signifies, “such contumely as Christ suffered.” Some, however, as Doddr., think it refers to the relation in which Christ stood to Israel, as his peculiar people (see Bp. Bull); and that he looked forward to the reward, in the promise of God respecting a future Saviour. And surely (to use the words of Doddr.) that *reward* could not be *temporal grandeur*, which he might have had, with much greater security and advantage, in Egypt; nor the possession of Canaan, which he never saw. It must therefore be the *eternal inheritance*, which was discovered to him by the principle here so largely described and recommended.

27. πίστει κατέλιπεν—ἐκαρτέρησε, “By faith he organized a systematical migration from Egypt, of which he was the leader and head.” The μὴ φοβηθεῖς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως, is by the best Commentators supposed to have reference to the angry words of the King at his last interview, “See my face no more,” &c. (Rosenm.) Τὸν γὰρ ἄρατον ὡς ὠρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε. At ἐκαρτ. must be understood αὐτὸν, i. e. τὸν βασιλέα. The sense is: “he courageously encountered the hazards of disobedience to the earthly and visible King, as keeping in view his paramount duty to that Monarch who is *invisible*, the Lord of heaven and earth.” In this absolute sense καρτερεῖν frequently occurs in Euripides. It is re-

marked by Theophyl. : Ὡσανεὶ γὰρ ὁρῶν τὸν Θεὸν συνόντα αὐτῷ, οὕτως ἐκαρτέρει πάντα. And he aptly cites Ps. 15.

28. πίστει πεποίηκε—αὐτῶν, “In faith (viz. in the divine protection) he kept the Passover, and observed the sprinkling of the blood.” Ποιεῖν, like the Hebr. פָּסַח, signifies to *celebrate*, i. e. to slay and eat. See Matt. 26, 18. And in this sacrificial sense the Latins used *facere*, and the Greeks ἐρδεῖν and ῥέζειν. (Ern.) Πεποίηκε τὴν πρόσχυσιν, “he sprinkled,” &c. Now the Passover he, as he was commanded, celebrated on the night of their departure from Egypt. At ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, must be understood ἄγγελος (as 1 Cor. 10, 10. ὀλοθρευτῆς), the angel of death who brought the pestilence. I would observe that ὄλλυμι (from whence ὄλεθρος) seems to signify *totally destroy, hurl to perdition*; and ὄλως comes from the Hebr. בָּלַע. Τὰ πρωτότοκα scil. γεννήματα: for the pestilence destroyed the first-born of *animals* as well as men. Θίγη is put, by euphemism, for *destroy*. And indeed the touch of the plague is destruction.

Now the merit of faith under such peculiar circumstances was great indeed.

29. πίστει διέβησαν—κατεπόθησαν. The ἐρυθρ. θαλ. is commonly called the *Red Sea*. But this is founded in a vulgar error, and the appellation rather arose from its proper name Mare Erythræum, which, the Commentators say, was derived from King Erythras, undoubtedly the same with Esau, or Edom, who was a *red man*. So Grot. and others. It is called by Moses at Exod. 15, 22. יַם סוּף, *the weedy sea*. And such the accounts of modern tourists, as Niehbuhr and others (see Harmer) testify it to be. But whether these weeds give a colour to it, so as to originate the name *Red Sea*, is, I think, very doubtful.

Ἦς (scil. διαβάσεως, for διέβησαν) πείραν λαβόντες, *making a trial, trying*. So the best interpreters. See Raphel, Kypke, and others. Κατεπόθησαν, “were swallowed up by the sea,” literally, *were swallowed*

down (κατὰ). The more correct expression would have been κατεποντίσθησαν, which is used by Philo on this subject.

30. πίστει—ἡμέρας. Some recent Commentators (see Dind.) run into strange speculations on this event, from which they strive to remove all idea of miraculous power. Into these I shall not enter. Ernesti, indeed, defends the miracle; but πίστει cannot (as he would propose) be construed with κυκλωθ., without great violence; neither is this necessary. The plain sense is: "It was by or through faith that the walls of Jericho fell, after having been besieged seven days;" the period foreshown by God, at which the city walls should fall. Now this was permitted to happen ἐπὶ πίστει, "on account of the faith of Joshua and his army in the assurances of God." And therefore to that faith the fall of the city may (popularly) be ascribed.

31. πίστει Παὰβ—εἰς ἡγνῆς. The sense of πορνῇ here depends upon that of the Hebr. נָזַן at Josh. 2, 1., which many eminent philologists derive from נָזַן, to feed, maintain; thus taking it to denote a *hostess*, or *innkeeper*. And this they support from the Chaldee interpreter, and Chrys. And so (I would add) Joseph. p. 179. Ed. Huds. See Carpz. Schleus. and Dind., which last Commentator, however, urges some strong reasons why this sense of *hostess* cannot be acceded to. If so we may suppose, with many Commentators, that she is called a harlot, as having been *once* so. See Matt. 21, 31. There is no doubt, however, but that the words *hostess* and *harlot* (or *procuress*) were convertible terms; since among those corrupt people, innkeepers were usually such. See Grot.; hence Braun thinks she might be *both*. I should rather conjecture that πορνῇ was the appellation given, by that gross and vicious people the Canaanites, to *all* hostesses, whether they were, or were not πορναὶ, properly so called; and that Rahab was *not*, and *probably* had never *been*, such. Now her *faith*, which made her a fit object of mercy, was

in the existence of the one true God and of his power (as evinced on many former occasions) to defend the Israelites, his people, and destroy their enemies.

31. δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης. The best Commentators explain μετ' εἰρήνης by μετ' ἐπιμελείας, *multā cum solitudine et humanitate, amanter, benignè*, which interpretation may be admitted; but there is perhaps an allusion to some formula of address on receiving any one to a house; and as the words at parting were, "Go in peace," so there might be, "Come in peace," like בָּא לָוֶן, which salutation (as וְלֵוֶן implied security, tranquillity, and happiness of every kind) was an implied assurance of kind treatment.

32. καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; ἐπιλείψει γὰρ μὲ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος. These were forms in common use with the best writers, especially orators, from whom Wets. adduces several examples.

33, 34. οἱ διὰ πίστεως—λεόντων. It is observed by Rosenm., that these attributes of faith do not, indeed, pertain to the *whole* of the persons mentioned at ver. 32., but only *some* of them; yet almost all of them subjugated kings and states. And this they did through faith in the God of Israel.

33. εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην. Menoch. and, of the recent Commentators, Dind. and Rosenm., think that δικαιοσ. may be understood specialiter, of just judgment in deciding causes, as Samuel and others. Theophyl. explains it τὸ ἐκάστῳ ἀπονεμῆν τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν, whether friends or foes. But it seems better to adhere to the *general* sense, as being more appropriate and natural. So Ernesti explains, *sanctè, piè, religiosè facere, ad legem divinam vivere*. There may be, too, an allusion to *habitual* virtue; as in the οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν in Matt. 7. 33., &c. Now to do this they would be especially animated by faith in God.

33. ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, "by this faith they obtained the promised blessings." The histories of the Old Testament are the best commentary on this clause. In

the ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων there is reference to the cases of Daniel, Samson, and David, on which see the Old Testament. Now such things could only have been done by the help of God, which would be vouchsafed to *faith* alone. Ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρὸς. This alludes to the case of Schadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, Dan. 3, 27 & 29. Of these it is figuratively said that they *quenched the power of the fire*, namely, because their firm faith in the protection of the God of Israel caused that it should have no power over them, but, as far as respected them, be quenched. Ἐφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας. This is an evident Hebraism (though not *merely* such; as appears from Soph. Aj. 651.) for “escaped the edge of the sword.” So the Sept. φεύγει μάχαιραν, Sirach 28, 18. and 1 Macc. 5, 28. See Carpz. and Heinr. Ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, “from being weak.” An idiom found in the Classical writers. So Thucyd. 7, 42. τῷ δὲ στρατεύματι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὡς ἐκ κακῶν, ῥώμῃ τις ἐγένητο. Rosenm. refers to the case of Samson, Judg. 16, 19. compared with ver. 29. Παρεμβολὰς ἐκκλιναν ἄλλοτρίων. The παρεμβ. may (as in the *Classical* writers) be put for the *armies* which filled the camp. See Schleus. Lex. Κλίνειν is here, as often in the best writers, used in a hiphil sense for ἐγκλίνειν. It signifies to *put to the rout*, like the Latin *inclinare castra*. See Dind. Ἀλλοτρίων, i. e. the Gentiles and idolaters.

35, 36. The Apostle now passes (by a natural association of ideas,) from the case of those who were *delivered from danger* through faith, to that of those who *endured evils* of every kind, under its support. It is observed by Dind. : “Duo hæc exempla matrum, quæ demortuos filios in vitam revocatos acceperunt, scriptori suggerunt tristiora fata illius mulieris quæ filios suos in crudelissimâ persecutione sub Antiocho Epiphane necatos non recuperaret ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. Nam antea nihil de persecutione in Judæos ob religionem suam grassante consignatam legimus.”

On the ἔλαβον, &c. see 1 Kings, 17, 30. and 2 Kings 4, 21. The ἐξ ἀναστάσεως is for ἀναστήσαντας.

35. ἐτυμπανίσθησαν. This term, which seldom occurs in the Classical writers, is here used for ἀποτ., which is found in many good writers. What sort of a punishment this was, is not certain: but that it is here meant *unto death*, seems probable; and I would render ἐτυμπ., *beaten to death*. So Gloss. Alberti, ἐτυμπανίσθησαν ἀνιρέθησαν. And so Œcumen. Much has been said by a Gataker ap. Suic. Thes. in voc., partly to the purpose, and partly not. The significations assigned by the Greek Commentators are chiefly three. Photius has the following exposition: τυμπανίζεται ξύλω πλήσσεται, ἐκδέρεται καὶ κρέμαται. Others explain: σφαιρίζεται, or ἀπετμήθησαν, or ἀνιρέθησαν. Now, to reconcile these, the modern Commentators are much perplexed. Some of them take the term to denote *equulei supplicium*. The truth seems to be, that τύπανον, which comes from τύπτω, signified, properly, a *beating-stick* (like the French *bâton*); but was often used to denote a *beating*, or *whipping post*. Hence τυμπανίζεσθαι denoted the *punishment* of the whipping post, i. e. ξύλος πλήσσεσθαι: and as that was often exceedingly severe, it is no wonder that the term should be sometimes explained by the Greek Lexicographers σφαιρίζω, ἐκδέρω, which signify, not literally, to *flay*, or *strip off the skin*, but, metaphorically, to *beat severely*, sometimes even to death. So our *flog*, which is cognate with *flay*. This signification indeed, of δέζω (whence δορὺ), is almost the only one occurring in the New Testament. See Schleus. Lex. How τύπτειν came to have the sense of κρεμάω, seems to have been thus. The τύπανον was probably made in this form, T; so that the criminal had his arms fastened to the two horns of the post, with his head above the top of it, and his feet bound to the lower part, without, however, reaching the ground; so that he might truly be said κρεμάσθαι. It is obvious how effectually this posture would promote the purposes of punishment, by rendering it impossible for the poor wretch to

shrink from the blows. Finally, how *τυμπανίζω* came to mean *ἀποκεφαλίζω*, and *ἀναιρέω*, is (I think) obvious: for most words denoting particular punishments, are sometimes used, by metonymy, in a general way, to signify all punishments producing the same effect, whether to death, or not. Several instances may be seen in the Notes of Gataker and Suicer. It must also be observed, that, as the beating was sometimes administered, not with sticks, or whips, but with leather thongs, like the Russian Knout, having pieces of lead sewed in them at the end, so *τυμπανίζω* came at length to be expounded *σφαιρίζω*. Here there is, doubtless, an allusion to the punishment of Eleazer, recorded at 2 Macc., 6, 30., and 7, 3., seqq.

35. οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, “not accepting the liberation offered at the price of apostasy.” This is a rare sense of *ἀπολύτρωσις*, which Schleus. illustrates from Luke 21, 28., *ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν*. The *κρείττων ἀναστάσις* Rosenm. explains, the resurrection to another and a better life.* And from 2 Macc., c. 8., it is clear that the doctrine was then believed; though without the certainty of the Gospel revelation. See Doddr.

36. ἕτεροι δὲ—*φυλακῆς*. Here, *πέϊραν λαμβάνειν*, as *supra*, ver. 29., is used for *πειρᾶσθαι* (See Gatak. Adv. ap. Pole). But here the sense is, *experienced, felt the force of*. The *ἐμπαιγμῶν* is thought to allude to 2 Macc., 7, 1. For the historical illustration of each particular, the ordinary Commentators, Pole, &c., may be consulted.

* Which is confirmed by Theophyl., who explains *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, i. e. a heavenly one, better than that of the wicked, who will only rise from their graves to suffer punishment here below; while the righteous will be caught up, to meet the Lord in the air, &c. Hallet thinks the opposition lies between the resurrection to eternal life, which these martyrs expected, and the resurrection of the dead children to life in the world just before. And this is countenanced by some antients: but it seems precarious; as does also the opinion of Crell., Hamm., and Doddr., that the *κρείττων* is meant as opposed to a present remission of their torments.

37, 38. Here are enumerated the severer punishments, even unto death, and that the most violent ἑλιθάσθησαν requires no explanation. With respect to the ἐπείρασθησαν, there is no doubt but that this punishment was sometimes employed by the refined cruelty of those barbarous times. The Commentators refer to the example of Isaiah, who was, we are told, sawn in two by a wooden saw. They also cite 2 Sam., 12, 3., 1 Paral., 20, 3., Amos 1, 3. To which I add Herod. 2, 139., συμβουλεύειν τοὺς ἱρέας—μέσους διατάμεσιν. And this punishment, I remember, is recorded in Diod. Sic. It has, however, sometimes occurred to me that the word may have been used populariter to denote, as we say, *cut and hack* any one to pieces. And so Appian, speaking of the murder of Cicero, T. 2, 556, 29., says that the Centurion τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπισπάσας, ἀπέτεμνεν, ἐς τρεῖς ἐπιπλήσσω, καὶ ἐκδιαπρίζων (*sawing it off*) ὑπὸ ἀπειρίας.

It is, however, a question of more difficult determination what is to be said of the ἐπειράσθησαν, which almost all Critics regard as corrupt, and of which there have been nearly a dozen different conjectures proposed. Some Critics employ the method of curing the limb by *amputation*. But this is a sort of surgery which is better not resorted to, except in extreme cases; and this is not one. In a Classical author, indeed, I should be inclined to suspect the word might be a Var. Lect. of the preceding; but in the phraseology of the Apostle the case is different; and the authorities for the omission of the word are too few, and easily accounted for (namely, from the difficulty of the word) to merit any attention. I agree, with Mill, Hallet, Pfaff, Schmid, Carpz., &c., that it must be retained, yet not interpreted (as it is by some), of *solicitation to apostasy*; since that was before mentioned; nor be explained, “tried with afflictions,” as it is by Schleus.; though he compares Ps. 35, 16., ἐπείρασαν με, ἐξεμυκτήρισαν με. And he might have added Eurip. Med. 57., τοὺς ἐν μεγάλαις δυστυχίαις ἐξεταζομένους. But the sense is too mild a one. The preference seems to be due to the interpretation of Sykes, Semler, Ernesti, and others, who take this as a *genus* for *species*, and understand it of *torturing unto death*. So ἐτάζεσθαι is explained by Hesych. βυσανίζεσθαι. And ἐξετάζεσθαι is frequently used in that sense in the Pandects. See St. Thes. So also Diod. Sic. L. 2, 525., has ἐξέτασαι in the sense of *tormenting*. The word may therefore be rendered, “tormentis (quæstioni admoti) tentati sunt.”

37. ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον. This seems to be a blending of two phrases; for I have no where else met with the expression. It may be observed, that the Apostle now, from the trials of faith in those who had to encounter *death*, passes to the less violent, but scarcely less severe ones of the unhappy persons who, having escaped their tyrants and persecutors, were, as wretched outcasts, exposed to every variety of misery. Περιήλθον is well rendered, by Dind., *oberrabant*. The περὶ may allude to the cir-

cuitous tracks and by-paths they had to pursue, to avoid their enemies. The *μηλωταῖς* and *αἰγείοις δέσμασιν*, must not be taken literally, to denote *sheepskins*; but, with the best Commentators, of *rude garments* made thereof, with the wool left on. See 1 Kings, 19, 13 & 19., 2 Kings, 2, 8., 13, 14. And consult the learned note of Carpz., who shows, from Philo, that such dresses were used by the poorest class, and those exposed to the weather, especially in travelling. Indeed, to the present day, they are in use among the boors of Poland, Russia, and Tartary.

37. ὑστερούμενοι, scil. ὑπαρχόντων, “destitute of necessaries.” Θλιβόμενοι, “pinched with want.” Κακουχούμενοι, “afflicted with evils of every kind.” The next words, ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἀξίος ὁ κόσμος, are a parenthetical exhortation. Similar ones in sentiment are adduced from a Rabbinical writer by Wets. It is observed, by Grot., that the Apostle means by this to say, that those of whom the world was not worthy, were by that world thought unworthy, even of house room! At καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς cannot very well be repeated *πλανώμενοι*; but some verb supplied from the context, which was omitted by the emotion of the Apostle. Mackn. paraphrases: “They wandered by day in deserts and mountains, and by night lodged in caves and holes of the earth.” Yet I suspect they often used these as *day* habitations. The sense may therefore be this: “they wandered about in the desert, residing first in one cave, and then in another.” The *σπηλαίοις* denotes those large caves with which Palestine abounds, and which are sufficiently capacious for the residence (dreary as it must be) of a considerable number of persons. This is evident from the interesting account of what befel Josephus after the taking of Jotapata. The *ὀπαῖς* denotes the smaller caves, serving for a miserable *lodging*. Among the passages cited by Carpz., there is Philo 1009., where it is said that men, women, and children were driven out, and compelled to shelter themselves in a *cave*. And

just after we have: ἐξεχέοντο εἰς ἐρημίαν καὶ αἰγιαλοὺς, καὶ μνήματα.

39, 40. μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως. See the note, supra, ver. 2. Οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. On the sense of ἐπαγγ. the modern Commentators variously speculate. It cannot mean *earthly* promises; for the fruition of these some *did* attain. Rosenm., Morus, and Dind., interpret it of *stable felicity*. The antients, and many moderns, take it κατ' ἐξοχὴν, to denote that of the Messiah, and the blessings to be expected through him. So Chrys., Carpz., and Storr. But the *former* interpretation seems the more agreeable to the context.

The next words assign the *reason* for their not having been permitted to attain them. But there is something about the sentence peculiarly perplexed. The difficulty is not *acknowledged* by any but Ernesti and Dind., who consider it at large, and attempt to remove it. The sense probably depends upon the interpretation of the τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν in the preceding verse, which, if it be taken of the promise of the Messiah, will require the present words to be explained (with Rosenm.) thus: “Bona promissa (tempore Messiae demum percipienda) non consecuti sunt, Deo melius nobis prospiciente, ita ut illi minime possent sine nobis (sine beneficio doctrinae Christianae in nos collato) felicitate consummatâ ornari.” If the interpretation of Morus, &c., be adopted. the sense will be (as expressed by Rosenm.) thus: “Quoniam Deus nobis melius prospicere voluit, ut scilicet illi ad perfectam felicitatem pervenirent sine nobis.” Perhaps the obscurity has arisen from extreme brevity, and the words may be thus paraphrased: “They all received *not* the promise (held out to virtue, neither *perfectly* in the temporal, nor *at all* in the spiritual one of the Messiah). No, God was pleased, in the exercise of his providence for us, to destine that they should not attain the perfect fruition of the Divine promises, till the time when they should enjoy them in common with us.

CHAP. XII.

VERSE 1, 2. *τοιγαροῦν—πάντα*. Having proved, by numerous examples, the efficacy of faith, the Apostle now proceeds, in the way of *conclusion*, to exhort them to steadfastness in the Christian faith. Now he founds his first argument on the great number of witnesses to their conduct.

The *τοιγαροῦν* is *conclusive*: "Wherefore being surrounded with such a cloud of witnesses." By the *witnesses* some moderns understand the *proofs* and *evidences* how highly God esteems faith, and how much he will reward it. But this seems harsh and precarious. It is far more natural, with all the antients, and the most judicious moderns, to interpret the *μαρτ.* of the *worthies* of the Old Testament, some of whom have been just instanced, who by their words and actions testified how much the objects of their faith were valued above all worldly considerations; including, also, the Confessors and Martyrs of the *New Testament*, as the Proto-martyr Stephen, &c. From what follows, it is plain that there is an *agonistical* allusion: and the *νέφος* well answers to the immense crowd of spectators, in the amphitheatre, seated one above another to an immense height. Thus *νέφος* and *nimbus* were used of a large body of men both by the Poets and prose writers. As to the interpretation of Rosenm., it is sufficiently refuted by the *περικείμενον*, on which it is strange the Philological Commentators, who adduce such numerous Classical citations on the *νέφος*, should not have brought forward the Ovidian line, "*Consedere Duces, et vulgi stante corond.*" The passage is elegantly paraphrased by Wets. thus: "*Fingite animo vestro omnes heroas, quorum constantiam et fidem modo laudavi, vos circumstare, et spectatores sedere vestri cursus, vestræ vel constantiæ vel defectionis.*"

"*Ογκον*, *weight, load*. I would compare Pind. Olymp. 9, 55., where the Scholiast explains: *ἀπόρρι-*

ψον, ἥγον ὡς βάρος ἀπόθου. Here there is a continuation of the agonistical metaphor. The ὄγκος denotes the remains of unsubdued vices, and those various sins, or vanities, including an excessive attachment to the world, &c., which drag down the soul to earth, and grievously impede us in running our spiritual race. So Theodoret : εἰς τούτους τοιγαροῦν ἀφορῶντες, κοῦφοι περὶ τὸν δρόμον γενώμεθα, καὶ τὸν τῶν περιττῶν φροντίδων ἀπορρίψωμεν ὄγκον.

The words following are exegetical of the preceding : and the καὶ may be rendered *even*, or *especially*. The εὐπερίστατον is variously explained. By Theophyl. : τὴν εὐκόλως περιϊσταμένην ἡμᾶς. By Theodoret : εὐκόλως συνισταμένην τε καὶ γινομένην· καὶ γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς δελεάζεται, ἀκοὴ καταθέλγεται, ἀφῆ γαργαλίζεται, καὶ γλῶσσα ῥᾶστα διολισθαίνει, καὶ ὁ λογισμὸς περὶ τὸ χεῖρον ὁξύρροπος. It is explained by the best moderns *cingens, circumveniens, decipiens*. And so Rosenm. and Schleus. But this is paying no attention to the εὐ. I cannot but suspect that there is in it a *military* metaphor. And I have elsewhere observed agonistical and military ones intermixed. The εὐ must then be referred to the arch fiend, the *Devil* : and the term may be rendered, *skilful to draw up forces around us, to surround and destroy us*. What sin is here meant we are left to conjecture. Most Commentators suppose, *apostacy*. But, considering what has occurred in the preceding, there seems to be also included *practical* apostacy, i. e. the living without any regard to our solemn obligations, as Christians.

By the ὑπομονῆς is denoted a patient endurance of the difficulties which we may, nay, *must*, encounter in our Christian course. It is plain that to *run with patience the race that is set before us*, is to run the Christian course so as to perform all the duties enjoined by our spiritual ἀγωνοθέτης. Among the passages here cited by the Philological Commentators the most apposite is Philo 203. τὸν προτεθέντα ἀγῶνα τῶν Θεῶν καὶ Ὀλυμπίων ἀρετῶν.

2. ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν—Ἰησοῦν. Here again there

appears to be a mixture of military and agonistical metaphors. Jesus is represented as our ἀγωνοθέτης, and also a *leader*, whose example his soldiers are bound to follow. The τελειώτην seems to refer to the former. By the τῆς πίστεως is not meant our *religion*, but that *faith* in God, of which the Apostle has just before adduced so many bright examples in the Patriarchs and Prophets, and to the great *archetype* of those, and many other virtues, he here directs our view.

He then proceeds to set forth the patient endurance of Jesus, as evinced in accomplishing the work of our salvation. The ἀντὶ is variously interpreted: but it seems rendered of Theophyl. and Theodoret, of the antients, and many eminent moderns, *because of*; as Eph. 5, 31. The χαρὰ προκειμένη, Rosenm. observes, is used as ἔλπις προκ. at 6, 18. And he renders the χαρὰς *gaudium instans*, summam potestatem, quæ mortem crucis consecuta est, Phil. 2, 9. But it may be understood of the joyful event in contemplation, which animated his endurance, namely, the accomplishment of the work of human salvation. So Slade: "As Jesus endured for the joy of finishing his scheme of salvation, should his disciples endure for the joy of being partakers of it." Αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, "despising the ignominy." A spirited and beautiful expression, to which I know no one comparable except that of Thucyd. 2, 62. ἰέναι δὲ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὁμόσε, μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι. So Herodian, L. 3. κρυοὺς καὶ θάλπους καταφρονῶν. And Dio, O. 7. 127 c. (cited by Wets.) μὴ σπουδάσαι γνωσθῆναι δόξης καταφρονουμένης. The καταφρ., Rosenm. observes, is to be taken *comparatè*. But this seems an unwarrantable limitation.

The words ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκάθισεν, seem *not* meant (as many take them) to suggest the reason for the patient endurance of Jesus; but to hint to us that *we* may expect *our* reward, as Christ received his (so Phil. 2, 9. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε), namely, that of being *with Christ* before the presence of God for ever, though not as he is and

will be, *ισύνθερος* and *σύντιμος* with God, and united with him in equality of dignity and power.

3. ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ—ἀντιλογίαν. The connection here has not been well traced by the moderns; though it is ably pointed out by Theophyl. In the ἀναλογίσασθε there is thought to be a *mathematical* metaphor. And so Schmid and Raphel. Most Critics are agreed that it suggests the *comparison*; q. d. “compare him who suffered such things (though the son of God) with yourselves. The ἀντιλογίαν is, as Theophyl. says, emphatical. Its sense is variously explained. In the E. V. it is rendered *contradiction*. But this is too limited. It is, I think, rightly taken by Chrys., Carpz., Dind., and Rosenm., to denote *all* Christ's *sufferings* of every kind. Though Ern. renders it by the general term *contumelia*; and refers to, and explains Luke 2, 34. Κάμνειν signifies to *fatigue*, *flag*, &c. and corresponds to our *tire*. Ἐκλύομαι is used as at Gal. 6, 9. where see the note. Loesner well explains this and other cognate terms, which he considers as agonistical. I would compare Diod. Sic. 5, 9, 220. ἤδη κάμνοντες ταῖς ψυχαῖς.

4. οὐπω μέχρις—ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι. There is some obscurity in these words. The difficulty turns on the ἁμαρτία. But it may be removed by reverting to the use of that term at ver. 1.: and the best modern Commentators are agreed that it has here nearly the same sense, and denotes the sin of *apostacy*, either *properly* so called, or what may be called *practical* apostacy, including all those lusts which war against the soul, and are so destructive of our well-being here, as well as our happiness hereafter. See Ern. and Dind., and the excellent illustrations of Chrys. and Theophyl. At the same time, there seems to be an allusion to the author and suggester of all, even the *Devil*, to which, indeed, some wholly confine it.

The words μέχρις αἵματος (for αἵματεκχυσίας, of which Wets. adduces two examples,) show *what kind*

of apostacy must principally be intended. "By resistance to apostacy even unto blood," is meant, so to overcome the temptations of the flesh as to be ready to shed one's blood in the cause of the Gospel. Now *this* the Prophets and others, especially Jesus Christ, had already done. Those whom he is addressing, the Apostle means to say, were called to comparatively light endurances ; and therefore had no excuse for fainting under them.

5, 6. καὶ ἐκλέλησθε—ἐλεγχόμενος, "And yet ye have (it seems) forgotten the admonition which addresses you as sons." It is observed by Rosenm., that παράκλησις has here a combined sense of consolation and exhortation. The passage here adduced is from Prov. 3, 11. For μὴ ὀλιγάροι Aquila has μὴ ἀποδοκίμασον: and Symm. μὴ ἀποθῆς. The literal sense is: "do not set lightly by." So Hesych.: ὀλιγαρεῖ ὀλίγην ἔχει φροντίδα. Ἐλεγχόμενος, "rebuked for sin." Ὁν γὰρ—παραδέχεται. For παιδεύει some MSS. read ἐλέγχει. On the μαστιγοῖ it is observed by Rosenm., that the Sept. for כָּנָה (*as a father*) read כָּנָה. And this reading seems to be more agreeable to the context. The metaphorical use of μαστιγοῦν and similar words is frequent in the Classical writers. The Commentators compare from the Sept. Tob. 13, 2. Sapient. 12, 22. 16, 16. Παραδέχεται, *receives with approbation, loves*; as Luke 16, 2. See Fisch. Prolus. 1, 8.

7, 8. εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε—ὁ Θεὸς, "If (then) ye bear (this) chastening of affliction," &c. Ὑπομένειν, Rosenm. observes, is here used in the sense of *perpeti*; as James 1, 12. Προσφέρεται, *acts, deals*. A signification common in the best writers. Προσφέρεισθαι literally signifies to *conduct oneself towards*. The sense is: "God hath a paternal care for you." The parenthetical clause τις γὰρ—πατήρ; is exegetical. "For what son does *not* receive correction of his faults at the hands of a father?" Εἰ δὲ χωρὶς—οἰοί. The ἔστε seems to be for ἦτε. The sense is: "If ye were without chastisement, then would ye be bastards,

and not sons. That would argue a less care over you by God. For of bastards men usually take less care than of sons." By πάντες must be meant all God's true sons and faithful servants; with especial allusion to the Patriarchs and Prophets above mentioned.

9. εἶτα—ζήσομεν; The εἶτα has an *argumentative* force; and when used (as here) in an interrogative sentence, this particle has great elegance. It is rendered by Rosenm. *atqui, jam vero*, τούτων, ἐπεὶ οὖν. Here again (as Theophyl. well observes) the Apostle shows by an *argumentum ad hominem*, that they ought to bear, &c. And the πατέρας τῆς σαρκός. Theophyl. well explains οἱ σαρκικοί πατ. "These (says Rosenm.), being themselves mortal, generated us to mortality." Παιδευτὰς, *correctors*. Καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα, "we reverently submitted to their correction," οὐκ ἐτολμῶμεν ἀποπηδῆσαι, ἀλλ' ἐνετρεπόμεθα καὶ ὑπεμένομεν, ὅσα ἂν ἐπέφερον, paraphrases Theophyl. In εἵχομεν and ἐνετρεπόμεθα there is a simple Hebraic construction.

9. ὑποταγησόμεθα, "shall we not obediently suffer what he inflicts." This is (as Theophyl. observes) a stronger term than ὑπομένομεν. With respect to the τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, it is variously explained even by the antients. Some understand it of the *spiritual gifts*; others of *angels*; others again, of *souls*. The last mentioned interpretation seems the truest; and is supported by Grot. and many eminent moderns. It is required, too, by the antithesis. Theophyl., who adopts it, remarks: Πρὸς γὰρ ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν σαρκικῶν πατέρων, εἶπε τὸ πνευματικόν. Rosenm. indeed takes it to denote *spiritual father*: but he explains it: perfectissimus, qui nunquam pro lubitu, sine idoneis rationibus castigat, vel errores in castigando admittit, ut patres humani solent. God is indeed *supposed* to be such by the context; yet that cannot be elicited from the expression.

9. ζήσομεν is very emphatic, and has an allusion to the *felicity* laid up for the just in heaven (and per-

haps also the *perpetuity* of it). I cannot but think that Dr. Doddr. in his elegant Epigram (formed from the *Dum vivimus vivamus* of the Heathen Poet):

“Lord in my view let both united be,
I live to pleasure while I live to thee,”

had this passage in mind.

10. οἱ μὲν γὰρ—αὐτοῦ, “Now they for a few days (only those of our childhood) chastened us.” The κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν, considered with the antithetical ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, must not be interpreted of *arbitrariness* only, but a neglecting to direct punishment to its only lawful end, the reformation and the final good of the offender; and aiming rather to excite *fear*, which is only the *means*, rather than the *end*; and seeking an end of their own, the giving vent to their passion and ill humour. Εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ, “for partaking of his holiness (δεκτικούς εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῦ, paraphrases Theophyl.); our virtue being exercised and strengthened by calamity.” Morus compares the precept to the Israelites: “Be ye holy; for I, your God, am holy;” and 2 Pet. 1, 4. θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.

Such appears to be the true sense; and it is supported by the best antient and modern Interpreters. See Chrys., Ern., and Dind.

11. πάντα δὲ—ἀλλὰ λύπης. It is well remarked by Theophyl.: πάλιν ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἐννοίας τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἔλαβε τῆς παραινέσεως. The δοκεῖ is *emphatical*: and at χαρᾶς must be understood πρᾶγμα; and both are equivalent to an adjective, *distasteful*; q. d. “it seems to be distasteful, if we consult our feelings; but it is not.” So in the Proverbs: “The root is bitter; but the fruit is sweet.” The words following are exegetical, and the sense is: “afterwards it is found to yield the wholesome fruit of virtue to those who are exercised by it.” Εἰρηνικόν, *wholesome*, like the Hebr. מְלֵךְ. So Rosen. and the best Critics. It is explained by Theophyl.: ἀτάραχον, λεῖον, ἡδὺν. And he observes: Ὁ μὲν γὰρ λυπούμενος ταραττεται ὁ δὲ χαίρων λειότητα τινα ἔχει καὶ γαλήνην. It may,

however (as Wolf thinks) have reference to that "peace of God which passeth all understanding."

Of the parallel passages here adduced by Wets. from the Classical writers, the most apposite is Dio Cass. p. 106. ἀγαπᾷ ὑμᾶς, ὡς πατὴρ παιδᾶς—γνώσεσθε δὲ, ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω, ἐν μήτε πρὸς τὸ αὐτίκα ἢ οὐδὲ τὸ συμ-φύρον κρίνητε μάλλον, ἢ πρὸς τὸ αἰεὶ ὀφέλιμον.

12, 13. The Apostle employs *another* image, to excite them to constancy in bearing calamities, *seeing that they produce such fruit*. There is here adduced a passage from Is. 53, 3. where for ἀνορθώσατε the Sept. has ἰσχύσατε. The metaphor is, by the antients, and many moderns, thought to be an *agonistical* one: but by others (as Carpz.) it is (more probably, I think,) supposed to be derived from the effects of extreme sickness (especially paralytick), or violent fatigue. Thus it corresponds to the figurative language at ver. 3. See Raphel, Carpz., and Dind., which last Commentator compares Sirach 11, 11. οὐαὶ καρδίαις εἰλαῖς καὶ χερσὶ παρειμέναις. To which I add Sirach 25, 23. and 2, 13. and Eurip. Alc. 204. παρειμένη γε, χεῖρὸς ἄθλιον βάρος and 411. ἰδε γὰρ—παρατονοῦς χεῖρας.

On the next words, τροχιάς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, which are derived from Prov. 11, 26., Dind. remarks: "Ulterius inhæret isti allegoriæ, quâ actiones comparat cum gressibus pedum, uti tota vitâ cum viâ et cursu confertur." He also observes, that the force of the phrase is, "walk in a straight path; turn neither to the right nor the left; weigh well your actions lest you err." And he might have added, that probably the Apostle had also in view Prov. 4, 27. "Turn not to the right hand, nor to the left: remove thy feet from evil." The sense, then, after withdrawing the metaphor, is this: "Take the straight road of piety and virtue, removing all impediments in its course." See Hardy. It is not improbable that this is a metaphor derived from the making of high roads, which among the antients were always carried in a straight course.

Τροχία signifies properly a *via trita*; literally on which men τρέχουσι. Hence our *track*. And so also *path*, from *pæthian*, to *tread*. Hesych. explains τροχίαι by αἱ τῶν τροχῶν χαράξεις. These, I suspect, were sometimes formed by *art*, and like our *iron railways*.

13. ἵνα μὴ τὸ χῶλον—μᾶλλον. Now when the feet are lame, from paralysis or otherwise, they ἐκτρέπονται, and produce no motion of the body. The ἰαθῇ may refer to that moderate exercise by which such members are benefited. And so the best Critics explain. The sense, however, is too imperfectly developed to enable one to be positive. The moral application is obvious.

14. εἰρήνην διώκετε—τὸν Κύριον, "Pursue and cultivate peace with," &c. So 1 Cor. 14, 1. διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην. Compare also 1 Pet. 3, 11. and Rom. 12, 18. Διωκ. is a strong term; and is found in the best Greek writers. To the passages cited by the Philological Commentators I add Thucyd. 2, 63. μὴ φεύγειν τοὺς πόνοους, ἢ μηδὲ τὰς τιμὰς διώκειν, and Eurip. Ion. 443. ἀρετὰς διώκε. It is here well remarked by Rosenm.: "Concordia multum valet ad constantiam in adversis. Ubi enim, qui in eodem cœtu sunt, incipiunt discordes esse, ad alium cœtum facile transeunt." He adds, that ἀγιασμός here stands for the whole *complexus virtutum*.

By *see the Lord* is meant, obtain an admission to heaven: and therefore the sense is the same whether Κύριον be interpreted of *God*, or of *Christ*. See Mr. Valpy.

15. Ἐπισκοποῦντες μήτις ὕστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

There is an ellipsis of ᾗ; and ἐπισκ. here signifies to *see to*, *attend*, *mind*. Ὑστερεῖν signifies literally to *be too late for*; and here, to *fall short of*, *miss of*. Dindorf renders it *recedere*, *descicere*. But this explanation arose from his confining the sense to *apostacy*: an undue limitation. For from the context it would appear to extend to a neglect of the duties enjoined by the Gospel, as well as a formal renunciation of faith in it.

The χάρις is variously interpreted. Most recent Commentators take it to denote *Christianity*, *the Gospel*, or the doctrines of the

Gospel. Theophyl. explains: τὴν πολιτείαν, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά. Perhaps these senses may be conjoined, and thus it will denote the Gospel of grace, the doctrines it reveals, the duties it enjoins, and the blessings it holds out, both temporal and eternal.

In the next words μήτις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ, there is some obscurity, arising (I conceive) from a blending of two metaphors, an *agricultural* and a *medical* one. We have here an allusion to, or application of, the words of Deut. 29, 18. The principal difference is, that for ἐνοχλῇ is read ἐν χολῇ. Hence Grot. and many other Critics would alter the ἐνοχλῇ here to ἐν χολῇ, which conjecture they confirm from the Hebrew text, and a similar passage of Acts 8, 23. But (as the best Critics from Hallet downward remark) this is not a *quotation*, but a modified *application* of the passage. And this Mr. Slade admits; though he thinks that as the verb ἐνοχλῇ does not convey a very appropriate meaning, and as it bears such a striking resemblance to ἐν χολῇ, he conceives there is great weight in the conjecture. His second argument is stronger than his first; for surely ἐνοχλῇ *does* convey an appropriate sense, and is well suited both to the *medical* and the *agricultural* metaphor; as will appear from the Classical passages adduced by the Philologists. The term literally signifies to *give trouble*: and it is remarked by Rosenm., that Hippocrates calls those medicaments ἐνοχλέοντα, which raise disturbance in the bowels. Now bitter roots, when once they get into a piece of ground, give no little trouble to eradicate them; and if not checked, spread so fast that they seem to infect the ground to a great distance. And to this, I conceive, the Apostle alludes in the μανθεῖσι. Though at the same time, there is also an allusion to the infection of vice. The ῥίζα πικρίας, it must also be observed, does not refer to *one* sin, as *apostasy*, but a virtual departure or ὑστέρησις from the benefits of the Gospel by any gross immorality. Thus the Apostle immediately makes mention of fornication and a Heathenish life, at variance with all religious obligation. But in the former sin the infectious tendency is especially seen, when the sinner is a female. On which compare Deut. 29, 18., a passage which the Apostle might have in mind, as St. Peter, Acts 8, 23. On the infectious nature of sin in general, the Apostle at 1 Cor. 15, has the impressive maxim, “Evil communications corrupt good manners.” And at 1 Cor. 5, 6.: “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” In Dionys. Hal. 602, 10. we have also a very similar passage, where the two metaphors are blended: ὥστε (I conjecture ὥστε οὐ) περίεστιν ἡμῖν ἱασιν καὶ ἀλεξήματα τῶν ἀναβλαστανόντων ἐξ αὐτῶν κακῶν ζητεῖν, ὅποσα εἰς ἀνθρώπινον πίπτει λογισμὸν, μενούσης ἔτι τῆς πονηρᾶς ῥίζης· οὐ γὰρ ἔσται πέρας, οὐδὲ ἀπαλλαγὴ τῶν δαιμονίων χόλων, ἕως ἂν ἡδὴ ἡ βάσκανος ἐριννὺς καὶ φαγέδαινα ἐγκαθημένῃ πάντα σήπη καὶ διαφθείρῃ τὰ καλά.

16. μὴ τις πόρνος, &c. In adverting to the case of Esau, the Apostle does *not* (as some fancy) impute *fornication* to him; but only means (though the

Commentators do not observe it) to hint at the similarity between the fornicator and Esau, namely, in this, that each sells what is most precious to him for a worthless and paltry gratification. On the rights of primogeniture, and the benefits attached thereto, see the Commentators, or the writers on Jewish Antiquities.

17. ἵστε γὰρ—αὐτήν. There is here an allusion to Gen. 27, 32—40., which is the best commentary on the present passage. Κληρονομεῖν signifies simply to *obtain*. Εὐλογίαν, the paternal blessing, and the benefits flowing from it, and especially those of primogeniture. For the blessing Esau received was not *the* blessing of primogeniture. The μετανοία has reference to *Isaac*, not to Esau. Μετανοίας τόπον οὐχ εὑρε simply signifies, “he found no mode by which to move his father to alter his words.” Schleus. cites Polyb. 4, 66. He might more aptly have adduced Thucyd. L. 3, 36, 5. ὑπεραίᾳ μετανοία τις εὐθὺς ἦν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναλογισμὸς κ. τ. λ. The αὐτήν may be referred either to the εὐλογίαν, or to the μετανοίας: but the *latter* seems preferable. See Slade. In ἐκζητ. the ἐκ is intensive.

18—21. Adhortatur Paulus Hebræos ad sanctimoniam, arcessens argumentum a figurâ legis veteris, quæ, ut olim dabatur, populum requirebat *purum et castum*. Multo magis nos sub Evangelio oportet esse sanctos. Quanto enim doctrina evangelica cum suis promissis præstat legi Mosis, tanto damabilius est ejus contemptus. Quod ut ostendat, modum primo enarrat datæ ac promulgatæ Legis; postea, ut affectus fuit quum populus, tum Moses. Potest etiam locus hic cum præcedenti connecti sic: Cavete vobis ne deficiatis a christianâ religione, qui enim deficiunt, ii amittunt bona multo præstantiora iis, quæ amisit Esavus cum posteris, exclusus e populo Dei. Nobis Christianis patet aditus ad Deum et cælum; veteri illi populo Dei non licebat proprius accedere ad Deum. Lex Mosis est severa, terrorem incutiens; religio Christiana est

mitis, animum tranquillans. Hanc rem illustrat Paulus ex historiâ Exod. 19, 20. et cum conditione veteris illius populi comparat feliciorem conditionem Christianorum. (Storr. and Rosenm.)

18. ψηλαφωμένω, *which is to be touched, reached*. So Rosenm. observes that ψηλαφάω sometimes signifies not so much to *feel*, as to *attain*. And he might have cited Acts 17, 27. ζητεῖν τὸν Θεόν, εἰ ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὖροιεν, where see the note. Whitby explains: “which was material, and by being touched after the prohibition, Exod. 19, 22. would procure present death.” Compare Exod. 16, 10. and Deut. 4, 11 and 15. Γνόφος denotes a collection of clouds piled together, or the thick darkness, almost to be felt, thence arising. Thus σκότος is here added.

19. καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ, καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων. By the σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ is denoted the pealing of thunder, which preceded and ushered in the φωνῇ ῥημάτων, the words of the commandments. So Matt. 24, 31. ἐν σάλπιγγι φωνῆς μεγάλης, where see the note. Compare also 1 Cor. 15, 52. and 1 Thess. 4, 16. Παρητήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον, “prayed that not a word more might be added.” Παραιτεῖσθαι signifies to *deprecate* (as αἰτεῖσθαι, *to seek*): and verbs of such a sense are often followed by a μὴ pleonastic. Such appears to be the true ratio of the expression; though most Interpreters take the παρητ. in the sense to *pray*.

Τὸ διαστελλόμενον, the solemn edict, the forbidding them to touch the mount, Exod. 19, 22. The words following show the *cause* of their fear, namely, the awful and mysterious sanctity of that place, which not even a beast might touch without being put to death. The words ἡ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται are not found in the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers; and having the appearance of coming from the margin.

21. καὶ, οὕτω—εἶπεν. I would point thus: καὶ, οὕτω—φανταζόμενον. The εἶπεν is thought by Rosenm. to refer to Moses’s *thoughts*; or it may (he adds) be understood of the *action*. It must (I should

conceive), at least, refer to the *uttering* of the words following, at least to *himself*. Compare Job 4, 14. Τὸ φανταζόμενον, *the appearance*, viz. of the fire, thunder, thick darkness, &c. The general sense contained in the whole passage is as follows: "You have not embraced a religion in which your approach is encircled with such ineffable terrors."

22—24. The Apostle now compares the economy of the Old Testament with that of the New, and the happiness of those who live under the New Dispensation. (Dind.) It is of most importance here to attend to the points of contrast here marked out, which are skilfully stated by Theophyl. thus: "*They* did not approach, as *we* do, but stood afar off. Instead of Sinai, we have the spiritual Mount Sion, the spiritual Jerusalem, i. e. heaven itself, and not, as *they* had, the desert. [So Is. 51, 3. "will make her desert like the garden of the Lord." Edit.] Instead of the *people*, we have myriads of angels. Instead of fear, joy (for that is implied by the πανηγ.)." And Rosenm., contrasting the two Dispensations, says: "In *Mount Sion* King David had his palace; in the *heavenly city* Jesus Christ hath *his*. Jerusalem was called *ιερόπολις*; but with better reason is heaven called the πόλις Θεοῦ."

The *ἑὼντος*—πανηγύρει is, by Carpzov and Slade, joined with μυρίασιν ἀγγέλων. And this is supported by the antient Interpreters, and seems the true construction. Πανήγυρις is often used in the Classical writers to denote a general assembly of a whole people, which, in antient times (in the Grecian states, and their Asiatic, Italian, and other colonies), was drawn together by games and festivals, sometimes annual, and sometimes quadrennial. Hence the term came to be applied to the solemn assemblages of the Israelites at Jerusalem on the celebration of the feasts. It answers to the Heb. *תענית* (*a feast*) at Hos. 2, 11.; and is explained by Hesych. *ἐορτή*. Here it may either denote the *general assemblage*, or the *place of assemblage*.

The πρωτοτόκων is, by some, explained of the *Apostles*. But it may also denote all those personages eminent for their faith and virtue; since the word, though properly used of those who are dear as a first-born, yet extended to all to whom might be applied the term *carissimus*. Indeed, the phrase following ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων seems exegetical of the preceding. On the force of ἀπογ. see the note on Luke 2, 1. Καὶ κριτῇ—τετελειωμένων. It is rightly remarked by Rosenm., that, from the context, it is plain κριτῇ denotes judge, not in its *harsher* acceptance, of one denouncing punishments, or of a *legislator*, at whose presence on Mount Sinai even Moses trembled (see ver. 21.); but in that *milder* sense in which the term is used at 10, 30. and 2 Tim. 4, 8. And so our Poet, "Thus the great judge, with equal eye o'er all," &c. So also at Matt. 12, 23. κρινονία is explained, by the best Commentators, as simply denoting pre-eminence over," &c. (where see the note.) In the τετελειωμένων there is an agonistical metaphor, used

of those who have attained the great end (τέλος) of their exertions, the prize. See Phil. 3, 12. Theophyl. explains ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν εὐδοκίμησάντων καὶ τελείων φανέντων παρὰ Θεῶ. So Doddr. : *justified before God, sanctified in their natures, and holy in their lives.*" The term is used of our Lord's exaltation to glory at 7, 28. Here it is applied to denote that blessed state to which the disembodied spirits of the righteous may be permitted to attain before the resurrection (for τετελειωμένων is, as Schleus. says, for τετελειωμένα) ; and it is used, by anticipation, of the τέλος, or prize, destined to reward their labours. See Slade and Hallet.

To this glorious assemblage, which he so beautifully figures, the Apostle finally adds καὶ διαθήκης—'Αβελ. In which words there is some obscurity arising from what Doddr. calls a transposition of what one should have thought the most natural order here. This he rightly ascribes to the rapturous manner in which St. Paul conceived of these things, and his fulness of matter when he touched upon them. Rosenm. here supposes an hendiadis, and renders : " Ad Jesum, qui novum fœdus sanxit piaculo sanguinis sui," &c. After all that has been said, I must assent to the opinion of those eminent Critics who think that παρὰ τὸν 'Αβὲλ may signify, " better than (the blood of) Abel." Which is quite agreeable to the popular style, and is countenanced by the antients. Some MSS., indeed, read τὸ 'Αβὲλ, sc. αἷμα τοῦ 'Αβὲλ, but perhaps by a gloss. The αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ adverts to that ceremonial sprinkling by the blood of Christ in the New Covenant, by which our hearts (as the Apostle said, supra 10, 12.) are " sprinkled from an evil conscience," and we are liberated from the penalty of sin. So Theophyl. : Τὸ γὰρ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ῥαντισθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἀκάθαρε καὶ ἡγίασε. The sense of κρείττονα λαλεῖ παρὰ τὸν 'Αβὲλ is clear from Gen. 4, 10., cited by Theophyl., who adduces the following exposition of Cyril : τὸ μὲν αἷμα τοῦ 'Αβὲλ, κατεκράγει τοῦ φονευτοῦ· τὸ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν λαλεῖ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα. See Rosenm., who compares 2 Macc. 8, 4., and explains : " The blood of Abel calls for vengeance, whereas that of Christ for remission of sins ; Christ intercedes for us, and saves us everlastingly."

25, 26. βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσασθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. By παραιτ. is meant *excuse yourselves from listening to, reject, refuse to hear.* Λαλοῦντα, " him that so speaketh," namely, better things than Abel. For the λαλοῦντα is rightly referred by the antients to *Christ* ; though by some moderns it is understood of *God*. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκείνοι—ἀποστρεφόμενοι, " For if *they* did not escape punishment who on earth rejected him that spake unto them, how much less shall *we*, if we despise him who speaketh *from heaven*. By the ἐκείνοι—παραιτησάμενοι are meant the stiff-necked and ever unbelieving Israelites. By the τὸν χρημα-

τίζοντα is meant *Moses*. The term χρηματ. signifies to promulgate Divine oracles, as Moses did the Law at Mount Sinai. So supra, 8, 5. καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωσῆς and 11, 7. χρηματισθεῖς, &c. And so Josephus very frequently. Τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, scil. χρηματίζοντα. This, Rosenm. says, is for χρηματίσαντα. But Jesus Christ may be said to address men from heaven by his *Gospel*, and will continue to do so to the end of the world. Ἀποστρέφόμενοι, *turn away from, reject*.

26. οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, “Whose (i. e. the Messiah's) voice shook the earth,” i. e. the mount. See Exod. 19, 18. Νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται, “but he hath promised, saying (namely in Hagg. 2, 6.), Yet once, and again, I shake not only the earth, but also the heaven.” The νῦν, Rosenm. observes, is to be taken *absolutely*, i. e. in the sense of *quod attinet ad presentia tempora*. The ἐπηγγ. may be understood rather of *solemn declaration* than *promise*; though as the thing declared is *good* in respect to the persons addressed, therefore the term has both propriety and elegance. It is agreed on by the best Commentators, that the highly figurative language of the Prophet must be understood as predictive of that total alteration, and thorough reformation in religion by the promulgation of the Gospel, and which was also brought to pass in that very age.* Of this metaphor examples are cited by Pierce. See also the note of Whitby.

27. τὸ δὲ—σαλευόμενα, “Now that *yet once* indicates a change of the things which have been put in commotion, inasmuch as they are so made that those which are not shaken remain.” It is observed, by Rosenm., that we usually say ἔτι ἅπαξ, when we are planning something great and hitherto unheard of.

* So Rosenm., who thus explains: “Magnas, inquit, antehac feci mutationes; sed restat longè major. Illa verba—commovebo cælum, terram, maria, omnesque nationes—indicant: efficiam maximam orbis terrarum conversionem et revolutionem, sic ut omnes nationes ad Messiam veniant.”

But perhaps the phrase may also denote some change of order or system that shall be unalterable: for the *ἅπαξ* may mean *once for all*. The *τὰ σαλευόμενα* is, by the best Interpreters, taken to denote the *Mosaic economy*, shaken to the centre and entirely abrogated by Christ: and consequently the *τὰ μὴ σαλ.* will denote the system which succeeded to it, and which will be unalterable until the final consummation of all things. And so Rosenm. Other interpretations (though, I think, less probable ones) of this dark passage may be seen in Theophyl. and Dind. See also Slade.

28, 29. διὸ βασιλείαν—εὐλαβείας, “Having, therefore, received an unchangeable and unalienable kingdom,” &c. This, again, is spoken by *anticipation*, at least in its *full* sense, namely, the *fruition* of eternal felicity. Rosenm. would take παραλαμβάνοντες for παραληψόμενοι. But this is unnecessary. For *the being put into a state of salvation* is often designated under the same image as *salvation itself*. See Rev. 1, 6. 5, 10. Luke 12, 32., &c. Or by *receiving a kingdom* may be meant, being received into the Messiah’s kingdom, which had already commenced, and which will continue to the end of the world. Ἐχωμεν χάριν is a phrase of no little difficulty. Rosenm. and Dind. explain it, “let us give thanks.” But that yields a weak and inapposite sense. I prefer, with the antients and most moderns, to take χάριν in the sense *grace*; and ἐχ. for κατεχ., “let us hold fast,” &c. Others interpret, “let us so have it as to use it.” But that is included in the interpretation just detailed. Εὐαρέστως, *acceptably*. Μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας, “with deep reverence and fear (of offending him).” Or there may be an *hen-diadis*. I would compare Polyæn. 1, 16. θειοτέρῳ φόβῳ. The next words assign a *reason* for the εὐλαβ.; and are taken from Deut. 4, 24. The force of the metaphor is truly awful; and the sense (as Grot. remarks) is, that God is no less angry with *Christians* who sin than he was with the *Israelites*

when *they* sinned ; and those whom He overtakes He can easily, like a consuming fire, bring to perdition. This is meant, Theophyl. observes, not only to alarm the wicked, but console the suffering and oppressed righteous ; inasmuch as they have a God who is able thus to consume their enemies.

CHAP. XIII.

VERSE 1, 2. Having brought forward what forms the principal subject of the Epistle, he now concludes, with subjoining certain precepts, and commences with *charity*, as being the mother of all other virtues. (Hardy.)

1. ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω, “ Let mutual love among Christian brethren continue to be cultivated.” Compare Rom. 12, 10. The practice among Christians of calling each other by the endearing name of *brother* seems to have been derived from the custom of the Jews. It is observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle does not say *acquire* the virtues of φιλαδελφία and φιλοξενία ; for *learned* them they had : but, amidst their peculiar dangers, they might be remiss in the *practice* of them. Hence the propriety of the μενέτω, i. e. ἐδραία ἔστω.

As closely connected with the above virtue, and the chief evidence of it, the Apostle then inculcates φιλοξενία. In the μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε there is a sort of Hebrew idiom not uncommon. It imports the being continually alive to, and studious of. From the close connexion of φιλοξενία and φιλαδελφία we may suppose that the strangers here meant are Christian strangers. Now the argument with which this admonition is strengthened is taken from Gen. 18 & 19., as showing the reward of the virtue in question. Rosenm. states it thus : “ We may often chance to entertain guests of far greater consequence than at first sight they may have appeared to be. Hence the rewards of such hospitality will be greater than they would seem.” It is remarked, by Julian ap. Wets.,

that nothing so much tended to the growth of Christianity as the practice of hospitality among Christians one to another.

3. *μυμνήσκεσθε—σώματι*. The idiom in *μυμν.* is like that in *μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε* just before. The *δεσμίων* must, like the *φιλαδ.* and *φιλοξ.*, be understood of Christians in bonds (namely, for the Gospel's sake). *Ὡς συνδεδεμένοι*, “as if you were suffering the same evils.” So the Virgilian, “*Haud ignara mali miseris succurrere disco;*” and Achill. Tat. 7. p. 419. *ἐγὼ δὲ ὁ ἄθλιος, οὔτε αὐτὸν ἰδὼν, οὔτε ἔργου τινος κοινωνήσας ἢ λόγου, συναπηγόμην αὐτῷ δεδεμένος, ὡς τοῦ ἔργου κοινωνός.*

3. *τῶν κακουχουμένων*, “the afflicted and maltreated.” In the *ὄντες ἐν σώματι* there is a Hebraism for *ἄνθρωποι ὄντες*. Yet Rosenm. cites from Porphyr. de abst. 38. *τὶ δεινὸν ἦν, ἐν σώματι εἶναι;* On this and the following verse the Philological Commentators adduce numerous Classical citations; but they omit to notice that the strong argument to succour human distress, from the recollection that we ourselves are men, and exposed to like calamities, is frequent in the Classical writers, in whom it is usually expressed by *ἄνθρωπον ὄντα*.

4. *τίμιος—ὁ Θεός*. At *τίμιος ὁ γάμος* there is an ellipsis either of *ἐστι*, or rather *ἔστω*, as the best Critics are agreed; and this is more agreeable to what precedes and what follows. The *κοιτὴ* is synonymous with the *γάμος* in the former clause of this parallelism. *Ἐν πᾶσιν* is, by Dind., taken as a masculine for *inter omnes*, i. e. both the single and married: by others, as a neuter, with the subaudition of *πράγμασι*, *omni ex parte*. And this ellipsis I find supplied in Dinarch. 94, 34. *ἀχθομένη τοῖς παροῦσι πράγμασι*. But the former method is approved by the most eminent Commentators, and seems more agreeable to what follows.

4. *κοίτη ἀμίαντος* (scil. *ἔστω*), “let it be kept pure, holy, inviolate, and unpolluted by adultery.” If *ἐστι* be supplied in the former clause, the sense will be this: “Marriage is in all respects honourable, and the

bed is without defilement." The ἀμίαντος will then denote that which is not liable to censure, nor morally evil. Now the errors even of that early age might make it not improper for the Apostle to inculcate this truth.* It is, however, not improbable that the sentence is purposely left doubtful, in order that both the above senses might be included.

Κρινεῖ is for κατακρινεῖ. This the Apostle denounces not only against adultery, but fornication, which leads to it. How different from the Grecian sages and legislators, who tolerated simple fornication, as tending to preserve the virtue of married women! Rosenm. observes, that when it is said God shall *judge*, it is suggested that he will *punish* even those violaters of purity who escape the world's judgment, or are not punished by human laws.

5, 6. ἀφιλάργυρος—παροῦσιν. To the mention of *fleshly lusts* is aptly subjoined that of the heartless *avarice* which is usually found in the votaries of sensuality. Τρόπος, for τρόποι, *mores*. Though the singular is found in good authors, as Plato, and his imitator Philo. The ellipses here are ἔγωγε ἀνῆτε. On ἀρκ. I have before treated. Τοῖς παροῦσιν, scil. χρήμασι, "such means as are in your possession (without excessive anxiety after what is not so)." The παροῦσιν, too, has a notion of what is *present*, in opposition to what is *future*. And this sense is here very suitable. Wets. well paraphrases: "Ne anxii sint, sed officium facientes futura Deo commendent, mediocribus interim contenti." Among his numerous Classical citations are Justin 3, 1, 6. Bacabasum, qui præsenti statu contentus rem prodit Artaxerxi. Phocylid. 4. Ἀρκεῖσθαι παρόντων, καὶ ἀλλοτρίων ἀπέχεσθαι. To which I add D. Cass. 253, 77. τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀρκεσθήσομαι & 324, 26. τῇ παρούσῃ

* Even among the *Heathens*, it may be observed, marriage was considered not as a *civil compact* but as a *religious ceremony*. Thus Thucyd. 1, 15, 6. reckons this among the τὰ ἱερὰ, where the Scholiast annotates thus: καὶ γὰρ ὁ γάμος ἱερός. And Duker refers to Spanh. Dissert. 11. de Nummis, p. 292.

καταστήσει ἀρκ. Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 6. ἀρκεῖ μοι τὰ παρόντα. Joseph. 858, 29. τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀρκῶν ἦν. Di-narch. 94, 34. ἀχθομένη τοῖς παροῦσι πράγμασι.

Αὐτὸς, i. e. Θεός, just before. But the Hebrews sometimes use שׁוּן in like manner. The words are from Joh. 1, 6.; though similar ones are found in Deut. 31, 6. 1 Paral. 28, 20. The words following are from Ps. 118, 6., in which ἄνθρωπος is emphatic, and signifies *men*. The passage is (as Rosenm. observes) very suitable to the Christians, who, for religion's sake, were often deprived of their property.

7. μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν. The Apostle exhorts them to imitate the example of their spiritual pastors, and those who have furthered their Christian instruction. The ἡγουμ. will denote Christian teachers of every kind, both Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. See Luke 22, 26. Acts 15. 22. "Ὡν ἀναθεωροῦντες—πίστιν," "surveying, attentively considering the end and result of whose conduct, imitate their faith." The ἀνα is intensive; for the term (as Theoph. observes) contains a metaphor taken from *painting*, in which the pupils steadily survey the archetype of their master. Ἀναστροφῆς *manner of life, conduct*. So Theophyl. πολιτείας. Compare 1 Tim. 4, 12. James 3, 12. 1 Pet. 4, 15 and 18. So Job. 4, 19. ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ. And so not unfrequently in the Classical writers. Τέλος denotes the *result*, namely, the being liberated from the evils of this world, and received to the fruition of the joys of another and a better. In the next words μιμείσθε τὴν πίστιν the Apostle adverts to that principle which would enable them to show such examples of constancy and of virtue. See Theophyl.

8. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς—αἰῶνας. I agree with Mr. Slade, that these words are to be referred both to the preceding and the following verses, and be understood of the *nature* and *object* of their faith, as well as of *doctrines* of their religion. This is supported by the expositions of the antient Commentators. See Theoph. It is observed by Rosenm., that the formula χθὲς καὶ

σήμερον answers to the Hebr. גַּמְלָה--גַּמְלָה at Exod. 5, 14. *uti olim, ita et nunc*. Compare Gen. 31, 2. and Sir. 38, 14.

9. διδαχαῖς—περιφέρεσθε, “Be not hurried and tossed about with various and strange doctrines.” Some MSS. read παραφ., which many eminent Critics prefer. The sense will then be, “carried out of your course.” But this, as the subject here is *instability*, not *apostacy*, is less apposite. Whereas περιφέρεσθαι signifies to be tossed to and fro, and so to go no where. Besides, the common reading is strongly confirmed by the parallel expression at Eph. 4, 14. μήκετι—περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας. Other reasons for retaining it may be seen in Ern.

The ξέναῖς is thought by the best Commentators to have reference to the doctrines of the Judaizers: but it may advert to all doctrines at variance with the Christian verity. Καλὸν γὰρ—περιπατήσαντες. The καλὸν—οὐ is by some taken to be equivalent to *melius est*. But this seems an unnecessary refinement. Βεβαιουῖσθαι τὴν καρδίαν is explained by Rosenm., as a Hebraism answering to לֵב עָדָה, *se recreare*, Gen. 18, 5.; and he renders it *support and comfort*. Χάριτι denotes the *Gospel*, the doctrine of salvation by grace, without the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law; as is plain from the antithetical βρώμασι, which denotes the meat offerings of the Mosaic Law, which some wished to be with the Christian Eucharistical sacrifices. Περιπατεῖν here, as often, denotes *habitual practice of*.

Others regard the καλὸν—καρδίαν as parenthetical, and lay down a somewhat different, but not (I think) so apt a sense.

10. ἔχομεν—λατρεύοντες. Sequitur locus propter adhibitam allegoriam satis tortuosus atque molestus, in quo scriptor phantasiæ suæ vividitati admodum indulgens ab unâ sententiâ in aliam, etsi maximè semotam, transiliire non dubitat. Namque quum antea dixisset, eos, qui ciborum discrimen observâs-

sent, nihil inde utilitatis cepisse: nunc mortem Christi, quia nonnulla sacrificia in cibum aliis cedebant, cum sacrificio confert, sed eo maximè impeditum locum reddit, et perplexum. (Dind.)

The *θυσιαστήριον* is by some interpreted of *Christ*; by others, of the Eucharistical table; by others again, of the doctrine of the Gospel; and by others, of Divine worship. The first and second interpretations seem to most deserve the preference: but I agree with Dind., Rosenm., and Mackn., who suppose it put, by metonymy, for the *victim itself*, i. e. Christ, who was offered up for our sins; which offering is commemorated in the sacrament. Ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν—λατρεύοντες, “Christians have their victim, but of which *they* are not authorized to eat, who are attached to the tabernacle (worship), as are the Judaizers.” Such is the sense laid down by the best modern Commentators. See Dind. and Rosenm. Now the reason is plainly this, that by placing salvation on the ground of *works*, instead of *grace*, they deprive themselves of the benefit of Christ’s sacrifice. This is especially illustrated in the Epistle to the Galatians and Ephesians.

11, 12. Ὡν γὰρ, &c. In these words the Apostle assigns a *reason* why to those attached to the Jewish rites it is not permitted to enjoy the benefit of that victim which Christians derive from it; namely, because they despise and regard him in no other light than as a man deservedly brought to an ignominious punishment. He adds, that at this no Christian ought to stumble; for it was expedient that *our victim* should, in this respect too, be like unto those offered up by the High Priests. The whole passage is allegorical. All the words in these verses are opposed to each other; αἷμα ζωῶν and αἷμα ἰδίου Χριστοῦ. Ἀρχιερεὺς Ο. Τ. and Jesus, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγας τῆς ὁμολογίας. Κατακαίειν and πάσχειν. ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, and ἔχω τῆς πύλης. As in sacrifices περὶ ἁμαρτίας the victims were burnt, ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, so Christ was nailed to the cross ἔξω τῆς πύλης, accord-

ing to custom. See Levit. 16, 2, 13, seq. 4, 16—18. 5—7. On the burning of victims, whose blood was brought into the holy place, or Sanctum Sanctorum, see Levit. 16, 27. 4, 21, 11. s. 6, 23. Now in *this* respect was Christ made like unto these victims, namely, that he suffered without the gates of Jerusalem. But by his blood he really expiated the people. *Christians* enjoy the victim, i. e. the benefits of Christ, who died for our sins; whereas the Jews, who reject Jesus and his sacrifice, are not permitted so to do. (Rosenm.) See also Whitby, Wells, and Slade.

13. τοίνυν—φέροντες, “Wherefore let us go out of the camp to him, and bear the ignominy shown to him,” i. e. let us, after his example, patiently bear the insults, persecutions, and anathemas of the Jews, and, in a general way, whatever evil is to be endured for Christ and his religion.” Now to *go out* with him, is to bring ourselves to the same mind as that with which *he* went thither; and *so* to consider what he there suffered for us, as to feel unshaken attachment to his religion. Such is the sense as laid down by the best antient and modern Interpreters. See Chrys., Theophyl., Dind., and Rosenm. The ἔξω πόλιν is explained by Theophyl. ἔξω κόσμου, i. e. the vanities and vices of the world.

14. οὐ γὰρ—ἐπιζητοῦμεν. This is, as Theophyl. observes, *probatory*, and meant to indicate the *reason*, &c. (See Dind.) And he explains: “we have in this world no permanent abode (nay not even the *world* is such). We ought therefore to fly from it, and run to that city which is to come, even heaven.” The μέλλουσιν, as Ern. observes, involves the idea of *eternity*. It is remarked by Carpz., that there is here an allusion to what was said of Abraham, 11, 8—16., who looked to the πόλιν μέλλουσιν. The ἐπιζητοῦμεν is *emphatical*, i. e. “we have to *seek*.”

15. δι’ αὐτοῦ οὖν—αὐτοῦ. From the whole passage, especially 9—11. the Apostle deduces this exhortation: “Wherefore celebrate God with hymns, and

tell forth his benefits with a grateful mind." He, however, employs the sacrificial image, yet in his mind; and means to say, that as the old Priesthood is abolished, and fleshly sacrifices no longer to be offered, we are to have recourse to *spiritual* ones, literally, *immolate hymns to God, as if sacrifices*. Now that the Jews made much of external divine worship consist in sacrifices, and so represented various things, as penitence, prayer, alms, and hospitality, under that image, has been shown and exemplified by Schoettg., Wets., Heinr., &c. (Dind.)

15. δι' αὐτοῦ. Some render "because of him." And so Ern.: "propter Christum." But I prefer, with most antients and moderns, "through him (i. e. Christ,) as our Mediator." The *θυσία ἀνέσεως* answers to the Hebr. *זבח תורה* at Lev. 7, 12. So Philo 842. (cited by Carpz.) tells us what this is, adding that *ἀνέσεως* denotes ὕμνους, εὐδαιμονισμοὺς, *θυσίας καὶ ἄλλας εὐχαριστίας πρὸς τὸν τὰ ἀγαθὰ δωρούμενον*.

15. καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. This phrase is from Hos. 14, 2. where the Sept. deduce פרי from פרי, not פר, a calf. The sense is: "whatever proceeds from the lips and mouth." So Rosen. Schleus. takes the *καρπὸν χειλέων* for λόγον. But this will be too much paring down the sense. The whole passage may be thus translated: "Through him (i. e. Jesus Christ,) let us continually offer up (not the bloody sacrifice of animals, nor the vain oblations of the fruits of the earth,) the sacrifice of praise to God, even the fruit (or oblation) of lips, celebrating his name."* Ὁμολογεῖν here, as often,

* So Justin Martyr, Greg., Naz., Chrys., Clem. Alex., Euseb., and others cited by Suic. Thes. Eccl. 1, 1425. truly observe, that God requires nothing but the sacrifices (bloodless ones) of pious praise. It is strange that Pococke should render the words, "the calves of our lips:" a very harsh interpretation, and founded in error; for in the former member of the sentence the Apostle has reference to the *bloody*, but in the latter, to the *bloodless* sacrifices of the Mosaic Law. Compare Hos. 14, 3. and Is. 57, 19. A similar mode of expression occurs in Pind. Isthm. 8, 101. ἐπέων δὲ καρπὸς οὐ κατέφθινε, and Pind. Pyth. 2, 134. φρενῶν Ἐλαχε καρπὸν. See Blomf. on Æschyl. Theb. 614.

signifies to laud and celebrate. Thus (Rosenm. observes) the Hebr. תרוח is rendered by ἐξομολογεῖν and αἰνεῖν.

16. τῆς δὲ—ὁ Θεός. The εὐποιίας is used κατ' ἐξοχήν to denote beneficence and charity; and κοινωνίας (which signifies the making others partakers of our goods) is added exegetically, or to strengthen the sense. Hence may be emended a passage of Artemid. 2, 14. p. 166. πρὸς κοινωνίαν εἰσι ἀγαθοὶ, διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνίαν καὶ εὐνοίαν, for which I conjecture εὐποιάν. In these words the Apostle adheres to the same metaphor, or allegory, as at the former verse, where see the note. On εὐχαρεστέται, (which signifies, “is well pleased,”) it is observed by Rosenm.: “Græcorum mos est, passiva formare et cum Nominativo construere, non minus ab Activis Dativum, quàm Accusativum regentibus.”

17. πείθεσθε—ἀποδώσοντος. It is plain that πείθ. and ὑπεικ. are expressions denoting to *obey*, *show reverence to*. The words αὐτοί—ἀποδώσοντος are by Rosenm. considered to be parenthetical. But that is not necessary. It should rather seem that the whole passage is highly elliptical; and it may be rendered thus: “They watch over your souls, and act (or ought to act) as those who must give an account, (and careful should you be) that they may do this (i. e. give this account) with satisfaction, and not with grief; for that were unprofitable and evil for you (as well as for them).” Such appears to be the complete sense; though the Commentators are not quite agreed. It is well observed by Theodoret, that the Apostle here enjoins on the *disciples* obedience to their teachers, and at the same time reminds the latter of their awful responsibility. For the λόγον ἀποδώσοντες suggests the reward, or punishment (as the case may be), which must result from the account they have to give of their stewardship. Στεν. is a very strong term, denoting *deep seated grief*. In ἀλυσιτελές there is a common litotes. The ὑμῖν is *emphatical*; and the force of the ἀλυσιτ. is well pointed out by Owen and Doddr.

18, 19. προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν — ἀναστρέφεισθαι, “Pray for us; for we trust we merit it by having a good conscience, in all things wishing to act righteously and holily.” This, Rosenm. observes, glances at the Jewish teachers, who had calumniated him, and raised disturbances among the Christian brethren. The sense of the next words is plain. The humility as well as piety contained in this and the preceding verse is truly edifying. Ἀποκαταστ. signifies here, to be restored for the various purposes of Evangelical instruction. From these words, Rosenm. observes, it does not follow that he was then in bonds; but rather being released from prison, he waits for Timothy as the companion of his journey (ver. 23).

20, 21. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς—Ἰησοῦν, “May God, the author of peace and every kind of happiness, who raised from the dead the great and supreme Shepherd of the sheep (i. e. the Lord of all Christians), by the blood of the everlasting covenant (offered by that great Intercessor), may He perfect you in every good work, to the doing of his will (and in order thereto), working in you what is well pleasing in his sight, &c. The use of ποιμὴν to denote *supreme head*, is common even in the Classical writers, from Homer downwards. The ἐν αἵματι διαθηκῆς αἰωνίου strongly inculcates the doctrine of the Atonement. Καταρτίζω signifies properly *to make perfectly sound*, ἄρτιος. The ἐν ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ is taken by the best Commentators for εἰς ἔργον ἀγαθόν. So the Hebrews use ל.

The above clause εἰς τὸ—αὐτοῦ is closely connected with the preceding: and ποιῶν depends upon καταρτίζειν. The *mode* in which this working is effected is explained by the Apostle himself at Phil. 2, 13 and 14. where see the note.

22. ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως, “Bear with,” &c. This suggests the idea of *profit by*; for he who bears with good counsel cannot fail to profit by it. By the λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως are, of course, meant the hortatory and consolatory parts of the

Epistle. The words καὶ γὰρ—ὅμῳ are elliptical, and signify, “for though I could have said much more, and written a large epistle, yet I have been content with this brief admonition.” Ἐπιστέλλω in the sense *to write an epistle*, is very frequent.

23, 24. Γινώσκετε—ἀπολελυμένον, “Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty.” Ἀπολελυμένον, “e vinculis in libertatem prodiisse.” Some think ἀπολύεσθαι here signifies *proficisci*, *set off*. And thus they render, “know that he has set off.” See Noeselt Opusc. Fascic. 1. p. 28. seq. Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, “the Italians.” So in Philo Legat. ad Caium οἱ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης are *Romans*; οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Alexandrines*. Now there were many Christians already not only at Rome, but throughout all Italy. (Rosenm.)

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

WITH respect to the question on the canonical authority of this Epistle, the following are the words of Euseb. L. 2, 23., as translated by Michaelis: "But it must be observed that this Epistle is now considered as spurious." This, however, is a very incorrect version. In the original we have ἵστεον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν. Eusebius plainly pronounces *his own opinion* of the Epistle being spurious, and does not report it as merely that of *others*. As to the *reason* assigned by Euseb. for his rejection, namely, because not many of the antients have mentioned it, that appears little satisfactory, nor seems to afford any conclusive argument against the genuineness of this Epistle.

On the Epistle itself it is observed by Hottinger ap. Jaspis: "Oratio Jacobi insignem habet δεινότητα, grandis est, vehemens atque incitata, frequens imaginum luminibus et comparisonum atque exemplorum luce. Interdum sublimis spiritu pœnæ prophætico adsurgit, et sententiarum pondere ac troporum et figurarum ornamentis et sermonis poeticii fulgorem effertur." Jaspis gives the following plan of the Epistle: "Jacobus Christianis extra Palæstinæ fines per orbem terrarum dispersis, maximè in Asia Minori, primum graviter injungit patientiam in miseriis fortiter perferendis. Deinde docet, meram religionem Christianam notitiam nihil planè prodesse, nisi facta accesserint; ad opprimendas pravas cupiditates et peccati illecebras prorsus evitandas admonet, a rixandi studio avocat, et pietatem re et facto maximè conspicuam inprimis urget, a nugarum temeritate, fastu, invidiâ et cupiditate in aliis dijudicandis eos deterret, ad mansuetudinem contra, vitæ integritatem, æqualitatem, et hospitalitatem cohortatur. Tum divitibus superbientibus pœnas divinas annuntiat, at pauperum afflictorum animos erigere studet, iisque, si pii perstiterent, auxilium divinum promittit, levita-

tem quoque in jurando vetat, officia ægrotis præscribit, ad preces excitat, quas mirificè valere. Eliæ exemplo probat. Tandem spem peccatorum veniæ omnibus facit, qui animum ab omni vitio revocatum rectissimè confirmaverit, et ad alios emendandos gravissimè incitat."

CHAP. I.

VER. 1. Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. δοῦλος. Rosenm. observes, that from this expression it cannot be inferred either that James *was*, or was *not* of the twelve Apostles. And, on the other hand, from the omission of ἀπόστολος it cannot be concluded that he was *not* an Apostle. For (as Benson observes) he was writing to persons to whom his qualifications were well known; therefore it was unnecessary to insert it. Thus neither does St. John mention his Apostleship, any more than St. Paul in his Epistles to the Philippians, Thessalonians, and to Philemon.

1. ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ. The ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, scil. οὔσαις, is for διεσπαρμέναις. It is not agreed whether by these are to be understood the *Jews* dispersed, or the *Jewish Christians*. The *latter* is indeed the more probable, though the disputants seem to make a distinction without a difference; for although written especially for the use of the latter, it must have been *indirectly* intended for the *benefit* of the former. The same applies to the Epistle to the *Romans*. (See the introductory matter to that Epistle.) With respect to the formula χαίρειν, scil. λέγει, *bids*, this is common both in the Scriptural (see Acts 15, 23. 23, 26. 2 Joh. 11.) and the Classical writers. On its use see Benson.

2—4. Orditur epistolæ argumentum, a commendandâ Christianis in Asiâ minore dispersis, iisque doctorum Judaizantium et novaturientium insidiis undique perturbatis, malorum patientiâ, et inconcussâ in religione tenendâ constantiâ. Cui quidem cohortationi viam quasi munit præmittendâ v. 2. sentiendâ hâc: Πᾶσαν χαρὰν, &c. (Pott.)

2. πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε. Wets. renders the πᾶσαν χαρὰν *merum gaudium*; Pott, *impensè lætandi materiam*. Compare Col.

I, 9—11. 1 Tim. 1, 15 & 16. Of this use of *πᾶς* and *omnis* examples are adduced by Wets. and Hottinger. Carpz., however, takes the *πᾶσαν* for *πάντως*. But though this comes to the same thing, yet it seems less exact. Here, of course, there is an ellipsis of *εἶναι* and *τοῦτο*. "Ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσῃτε ποικίλοις," "when ye fall into various trials and tribulations." Πειρασμ. is used to denote afflictions of every kind, but especially those which most of all try our religious faith, as persecution for religion's sake. Rosenm., however, thinks that St. James especially adverts to the trials of *poverty* to which the Christians who came as exiles to Antioch, were exposed; since from this passage on the enduring of adversity he, at ver. 9. seqq. and 2, 1. glides to that of the arrogance of the wealthy. But this seems not a very strong argument; and the speculations of Noesselt and others may very well be dispensed with. On the subject of temptation in general, see the notes of Whitby and Mackn., or Slade. On the use here of *περιπίπτειν*, Pott dilates much. It may be sufficient to say, that the term is used of what is *evil* (whence it has after it *νόσφ*, *συμφοραῖς*, *ἀτυχήμασι*, &c.; as may be seen by Wetstein's examples); and is synonymous with *ἐμπίπτειν ἐν*, or *eis*; though a stronger expression.

3. γινώσκοντες ὅτι—ὑπομονήν, knowing (i. e. *mindful*) that this exercise or trial of your faith produceth constancy. It is observed by Rosenm.: "Sicuti auri experimentum (*δοκιμον*) ignis est, ita Christianam fidem explorat, quicquid ei materiam præbet ad experimenta sui danda; quo pertinent calamitates. Fides autem sic explorata efficit *constantiam*, *ὑπομονήν*. Si enim periculum prosperè cedat, vires ad bonum ipso usu augentur et confirmantur. Vitio tamen hominum sæpe accidit, ut res adversæ exitum habeant perniciosum." The *ὑπομ.* must be understood with the extent of signification assigned to *πειρασ.* just before.

4. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἔχεται, "But let constancy produce her perfect effect," i. e. "show itself by your *works*;" for to these St. James every where exhorts. The words following are (as Noesselt remarks) exegetical of the *τέλειον*, "that ye may be entire and perfect Christians, in nothing deficient." And so Benson, Rosenm., and many eminent Commentators. Others, however, as Luther and Carpz., render: "Let your constancy endure unto the end; i. e. as long as you live." Thus (as Rosenm. observes) the *ἔργον τέλειον* would be an *ἀποτετέλεσμα*, and therefore would be an agonistical allusion. On perseverance to the end, see 2 Tim. 4, 7. This, however, seems not so natural a sense. On the force of *ἔργον* consult the note of Kypke.

The following expressions *τέλειοι*, *ὁλόκληροι*, and *ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι*, are synonymous (see Tromm. Concord.) but accumulated (as Pott says), *propter studium dicendi*; the third being exegetical of the first two, and perhaps containing a metaphor taken from the race course. Storr thinks there is an *agonistical* allusion. I would compare a similar passage of Isocrat. Panathen. *τούτους φημὶ καὶ φρονίμους εἶναι, καὶ τελείους ἄνδρας, καὶ πάσας ἔχειν τὰς ἀρετὰς*. Τελ. signifies *complete*, *perfect*. Ὀλόκληρος properly denotes one

who is heir to the whole estate, entirely heir; but it was commonly used to express what is entire, complete, and perfect. The most eminent critics, as Krebs, Loesn., Morus, and Pott recognise an allusion to the Jewish sacrifices, in which the victims were required to be *τελ. ὁλοκλ.*, and *ἁμωμ.* See a passage of Philo cited by Hottinger.

5. εἰ δὲ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας. On the sense of this very extensive term σοφία, Commentators are not agreed. Grot. and Rosenm. take it to denote *prudence in deciding and determining what is to be done according to circumstances*; and this they think is agreeable to what precedes. Others, as Carpz., think it must denote *spiritual, or Christian wisdom*, as shown in deeds, or as understood by teachers; but this is too limited, and unsuitable to the context. The sense is (I think) best laid down by Jaspis thus: sapientia quæ cernitur in eo, ut quis justâ cognitione et rectâ scientiâ instructus, de causis et de fructu harum miseriarum ritè cogitet, justum pretium rebus externis, quarum jacturam facit, statuatur, firmâ fiduciâ, præstantiâque animi gaudeat, ut sciat, quid in singulis rebus agendum sit, quod personis, tempori, ac loco conveniat. 3, 13 & 17. Est sapientia practica. See Mackn. and Dodd. Carpz. remarks on the difference between knowledge and wisdom, citing the Etym. Mag. in v.: Γνωσις Σοφίας διαφέρεται. Γνωσις μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ εἰδέναι τὰ ὄντα. Σοφία δὲ, καὶ τὸ τὰ ὄντα γενώσκειν, καὶ τὰ γνωστὰ πράττειν.

Αἰτείτω—ἀπλῶς, “let him ask it of God, who giveth (this and all good gifts) to all men abundantly.” Such seems to be the true sense: though some take διδ. *absolutely*; as Luke 15, 16. Similar sentiments are adduced from the Classical writers by Elsner (as Plut. de Is. and Os. Πάντα μὲν, ὦ Κλέα, δεῖ τ’ ἀγαθὰ τοὺς νοῦν ἔχοντας αἰτεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμης ὅσον ἐφικτὸν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις μετίοντες εὐχόμεθα τυγχάνειν παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων, ὡς οὐθὲν ἀνθρώπῳ λαβεῖν μείζον, οὐ χαρίσασθαι θεῷ σεμνότερον ἀληθείας’) and Wets., as Theocrit. Id. 17, 137. ἀρετὴν γε μὲν ἐκ Διὸς αἶτεν. At πᾶσιν, Commentators seem to have thought some *limitation*

necessary. Thus Hardy subjoins: scil. piè et rectè petentibus. Rosenm., more regularly thus: κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ δόσιν, dat cuique quantum et opus est accipere, Sir. 1, 10. But perhaps neither subaudition is necessary. It is simply meant that God is the giver of that and every other perfect gift which he imparts to all men, in various proportions according to his own good pleasure.

The ἀπλῶς most interpreters render *liberally*. So the Vulg. *affluenter*; and the Syr., *liberaliter*. Capell. and Carpz. render it *benignè, ex bonitate et gratiâ*, which (they observe) is agreeable to what follows. Yet the best of the later interpreters (as Pott and Rosenm.) explain it *simpliciter*, i. e. non ambitiosè, jactanter, aut (quod plerumque inter homines sit) in obliquum finem, sed mero studio beneficiendi; comparing Rom. 12, 8. ἐν ἀπλότητι μεταδιδόναι. Perhaps both the above senses may be conjoined.

5. καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος. This is variously explained; either of reproaching men for their importunity, or bestowing gifts in a haughty contumelious manner; or, not giving them at all. So Morus, Hottingen, and Jaspis. But none of these interpretations (I conceive) can be adopted, as being too limited. The most natural and best founded one seems to be that of some moderns, i. e. “who does not (as men too often do) upbraid others with the benefits conferred, and make them irksome and odious by reiterated recapitulations.”* Such appears to be the sense, on which we are not to seek refinements.

* Numerous parallel sentiments are adduced by Grot., Elsner, &c. from the Classical writers, of which the most apposite are the following. Philem. καλῶς ποιήσας οὐ καλῶς ὀνειδίσας ἔργον καθεῖλες πλουσίῳ πτωχῷ λόγῳ, καυχώμενος τὸ δῶρον ὃ δέδωκας φίλῳ ἔργῳ, στρατηγὸς γέγονας, λόγῳ φίλος. Aristot. Rhet. 2, 6. αἰσχροῖα —καὶ ἃ ἐποίησεν, ὀνειδίζειν μικροψυχίας γὰρ πάντα καὶ ταπεινότητος σημεῖα. Ter. Andr. 1, 1, 16. Isthæc commemoratio quasi exprobratio est immemoris beneficii. Plut. de Adul. p. 64. Ἄπαντα μὲν γὰρ ὀνειδιζομένη χάρις ἐπαχθὴς καὶ ἄχαρις. Liv. 5, 44,

5. καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. This requires the limitation, "if he ask it," or, "so far as may be necessary for the purpose in view, and according to the good pleasure of God."

6. αἰτείτω—διακρινόμενος. Ἐν πίστει, "a full assurance," viz. of God's power to give it, his benignity, and his willingness to bestow it, as far as shall be necessary, and for his real good. It is well observed by Whitby, that "hence it appears, that this wisdom depends not on our own skill and strength nor can it be attained without divine assistance." The μηδὲν (sub. κατὰ) διακρ. is exegetical, "not doubting of the power or benevolence, &c. of the Deity." Rosenm. rightly remarks: "Sermo est de precibus pro impetrandis bonis ad animi salutem pertinentibus." The force of διακριν. has been explained at Matt. 21, 21. Mark 11, 23. and Acts 10, 20. & 11, 12. compared with Judg. 22. and Sir. 7, 10. The sense is here aptly illustrated by a comparison to a wave of the sea. There is the same metaphor in our verb *to waver*.

6. κλύδωνι θαλάσσης. So κλύδων ὕδατος, which is most frequently used without the adjunct. The two terms ἀνεμ. and ῥιπ., the former of which never occurs in the Classical writers, are nearly synonymous, and are equivalent to the more usual ones κλυδωνίζεσθαι and περιφέρεσθαι. It is obvious how applicable this is to the mind of an unstable man, fluctuating between hope and despair. See Pott.

7, 8. μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω. It is well remarked by Rosenm., that these two verses are closely connected; and, when digested into the usual order, will yield this sense: "Let not such a man, doubtful in mind, and fluctuating in all his actions, think he shall *obtain* any thing of the Lord." Ἐκεῖνος is for τοιοῦτος. Λήψεται, *shall obtain*. The sense of δίψυχος is dis-

pro tantis pristinis populi Romani beneficiis, quanto ipsi meministis, nec enim exprobranda apud memores sunt, gratiæ referendæ. Compare also Thücyd. 2, 40. s. f.

cussed with unnecessary minuteness by the philological Commentators. It is best explained by Rosenm. (in the words of Q. Curtius) *qui nec velle nec nolle quicquam diu potest, quemque modo concilii pœnitet, modo pœnitentiæ ipsius.* "Ὅδοι, *habits, actions, &c.* Now fluctuation in mind must produce vacillation in action.

9—11. The Apostle now, passing from trials *in general* (of which he has so far been speaking), to a *particular kind* of trials, exhorts the poor not to suffer themselves to be depressed by their poverty, and the rich not to let themselves be exalted over much by their riches. (Pott.)

9. *καυχᾶσθω αὐτοῦ.* The sense of these words is somewhat obscure and uncertain. Hence the variety of interpretations. Many moderns take *ταπεινός* in a physical sense, as *ταπεινός* just before; and suppose the Apostle adverts first to the case of one reduced to want, and then to that of one stript of his possessions, for religion's sake. But this is very harsh, and little agreeable to the words following. Pott paraphrases thus: "tantum absit ut pauper egestate animum suum infringi patiatur, ut (vel ipsa fortunarum jactura propter religionem facta) dives potius sibi videatur, ac de divitiis suis (verioribus, religionis beneficio sibi partis), gloriatur." And he adds that there is a very similar passage in Prov. 13, 7. I, however, assent to the antients and early moderns (including Rosenm.), that *ὑψεῖ* (which is for *ὑψώσει*) is to be understood of that spiritual elevation to which he that humbleth himself before God, and faithfully serveth him, shall be exalted. *Καυχ.* here denotes simply *rejoice*. The sense may be thus expressed: "Let him console himself under the distresses and contumelies attendant on poverty, in the anticipation of that exaltation which he will one day receive at the hands of the Lord; an exaltation, indeed, of which he has in his Christian calling and election already a foretaste."

In the words *ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ*, most recent Commentators recognise an *irony* (and so Rosenm.), or an *Oxymoron*; as Jaspis, q. d. "Let him (if he will) glory in what, from their instability and perishableness, might rather raise feelings of humility." But as *ταπεινώσει* must be interpreted agreeably to the *ὑψεῖ* preceding, it should seem to mean: "Let him rather rejoice in those humbling doctrines of the Gospel, whose observance can alone save the *rich man*, who is encompassed with so many temptations, and whose salvation is so exceedingly difficult." The words following are merely illustrative of the instability of riches, and require little explanation. It may suffice to say that *χόρτος* denotes green herbage of every kind, like the Hebr. עֵשֶׂב. The *ἄνθος χόρτου* is taken, by Hottinger, to denote the *herba virens*. But this seems refining too much; nor is it agreeable to what follows, since the two words are plainly *distinguished*; and it very much detracts from the beauty of the image, which is unfolded in the words following. Of this image we have an imitation in Cowper's Task, B 3.,

"All flesh is grass, and all its glory fades
 "Like the fair flower dishevelled in the wind."

The Future is put for the Present, or rather the Aorist, Hebraicè. Upon the whole, it may be well to bear in mind, that there is here an antithetical *acutè dictum*, and, therefore, the words are not to be too rigourously interpreted.

11. ἀνέτειλε γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος, &c. It is remarked by Pott that the explication of the imagery passes into a narration of the things; as Ps. 103, 16., and some parables of our Lord. Or, as Rosenm. says, the Aorists are put for Presents; and, as Pott observes, the ἀνέτειλε καὶ ἐξήρανε may be taken as put for ἀνατείλας ἐξήρανε, the γὰρ for ὅτι, like the Hebr. כִּי, and the συν for ἅμα συν (or rather, I would remark, for ἅμα). The καύσωνι is by Benson, Pott, and Rosenm., rightly taken, not for the ὁ ἥλιος καύσων, "the meridian sun, but, with an ellipsis of ἄνεμος, for the wind called the *Simoom*, which usually blows up at sunrise. See also Chardin and Niebuhr, referred to by Pott and Benson in loco. So Jerome, cited by Rosenm.: "Cito flores pereunt, cito violas et crocum pestilens aura corrumpit." Ἐξέπεσε, *shrivels*. So לָבַד in Is. 28. Εὐπρεπεία, in the Classical writers, has several senses. In the Scriptural ones it has simply that of *beauty*. So Hesych. εὐμορφία.

The words following οὕτω—μακρὰνθήσεται contain the *application*. "So also perisheth and wasteth away the rich man in the midst of his goings and devices, plans and counsels;" or, according to Rosenmuller's version, *together with*, &c., which yields a good sense, though not so good a one as the other; for the plans of the rich are not altogether destroyed by their death; but there is little authority for this signification of ἐν. Πορείαις, literally, *goings*, i. e., *devices*, *counsels*. Μακρὰνθήσεται, יָשַׁב. A term (Pott and Rosenm. observe), properly used of *flowers*, but, in accommodation to the metaphor here, transferred to *persons*. Yet it is used by the Classical writers in similar cases. See Wetstein's examples, of which the most apposite is Philo 258, 43., μήτ' ἐπὶ πλούτῳ—σεμνυνοῦς, λογισάμενος, ὅτι καὶ ὀξείαν ἔχει τὴν μεταβολὴν, μαραινόμενα τρόπον τινά, πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι βεβαίως. It is plain that the Apostle is speaking of what is *usual*.

12, 18. Now, returning to the subject of ver. 2, 3 and 4., from which, from ver 5., he had made a digression, St. James proceeds to treat on πειρασμοὶ *in general*, and after having declared those happy who patiently endure temptation, ver. 12., he exhorts Christians not to suppose (as perhaps some did) that temptations, arising from evil concupiscence, proceed from *God*, (ver. 13, 14 & 15.), to whom nothing but *good* is to be attributed (ver. 16, 17 & 18.), and especially that most precious benefit of the *Christian religion* (ver. 19.). (Pott.)

The μακάριος ἀνὴρ is derived from the Hebr. אֲשֶׁר

וְנִסֵּי of Ps. 1, 1.; a common form, Pott observes, of introducing moral precepts (as Matt. 5.), the contrary to which is οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, &c. It is strange he should not have compared the Horatian “*Beatus ille qui procul negotiis*,” &c. Ὁς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, “who is called upon to endure trials and adversities;” so called, as serving to put men’s constancy to the *proof*. See Matt. 5, 10 & 11., Hebr. 12, 7., &c. The ὑπομένει Pott interprets, “*courageously endures*;” and he supposes an agonistical metaphor. But this is unnecessary; since the simple sense is, that “those who encounter adversity, are not *therefore* to be regarded as miserable, inasmuch as that adversity is meant for their *good* in the end, serving as an occasion for exercising their virtue; and so giving them an opportunity of obtaining the reward; as the Apostle suggests in the words following.

12. δόκιμος γενόμενος—αὐτὸν. Here there is plainly an agonistical allusion; and the δόκιμος γενόμενος is learnedly illustrated by Kypke from the δοκιμασία of the Grecian ἀγῶνες. So Philo, p. 545. (cited by Loesn.), ἀθληταὶ δυνάμεσι καὶ ῥώμαις καὶ εὐεξίαις σωμάτων μέγα φρονούντες, ἀνευδοάστον νίκην ἐλπίσαντες, ἐξαγώνιοι πολλάκις ἐγένοντο μὴ δοκιμασθέντες, ἢ καταστάντες εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα, ἡττήθησαν. By στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς is meant, the reward of (eternal) life and happiness; so that even loss of life (if it have to be endured for religion’s sake) will be abundantly repaid by a happy resurrection to another and an immortal one. Τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν. An usual periphrasis (as Pott remarks) for *pious worshippers of God*.

13, 14. The Apostle, having said so much about the *benefit of temptation*, guards them against the mistake of making God the author of sin, or ascribing temptations to *him*, as that imports an impelling men to sin. *Such*, he says, proceed not from *God*, but from the *lusts of men*, which, if yielded to, will bring death rather than a crown of life. And, therefore, though *trials* may be ascribed to God, yet *temptations* in the bad sense must not. Sin and death

proceed from the lusts and wickedness of men ; but God is not the author of evil, but, like the sun, is an universal benefactor, and the author of that is *good* ; nay even exceeds that luminary, as not being subject to change or variation. (Benson.)

Πειράζ. is here used in the *bad* sense, namely, *to be instigated to evil*. Many, it seems, there were who excused their sins, and especially their defection from the faith, by alleging the perils which accompanied it, and sought refuge in the doctrine of necessity. In opposition, then, to this baneful error, the Apostle assures them that adversities are not sent by God, to make men *worse*, but to make them *better*. Some Commentators think the Apostle has here reference to the *Simoniani*, who made God the author of sin. Bp. Bull fixes on the *Pharisees*. But it is judiciously observed by Carpz. : “ Ignorantur hi quos Apostolus intellexerit, et conjiciuntur frustra. In depravatâ naturâ omnium hominum hæret sententia, cui obviam it Jacobus. Is a Deo, ἀπειράστω κακῶν, immuni a malo, removet culpam, et in cupiditates perversas conjicit.” The *Heathens* also, as may be seen by Wetstein’s citations, held this doctrine.

13. ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπειραστός—οὐδένα. “Now God (annotates Rosenm.) wishes men to be as *He* is ; and as He is not tempted by sin, so neither does he *tempt any* to sin.” See Sir. 15, 11., seqq. Upon this whole subject of temptation consult Benson.

14. ἕκαστος δὲ—δεδωροζόμενος, “But whosoever is tempted, and impelled to sin, is hurried away and enticed by his own *lusts*.” Ἐπιθυμία has here the *bad* sense of *evil concupiscence*, a desire for things which ought not to be sought after, or, not to that degree. Rosenm. paraphrases : “when we are seduced to evil, *God* is not the cause : but it is, that we love the pleasures of this life, and this life itself, more than we ought.” And he cites Cicero in Pisonem : Sua quemque fraus, suum facinus, suum scelus—de sanitate ac mente deturbat.* There is (he observes) a Classical elegance in the phrase

* I add Æschin. c. T. p. 27, 5., μὴ γὰρ οἴεσθε τὰς τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἀρχὰς ἀπὸ Θεῶν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὑπ’ ἀνθρώπων ἀσελγείας γίνεσθαι—ἀλλ’ αἱ προπετεῖς τοῦ σώματος ἡδοναὶ καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἱκανὸν ἡγεῖσθαι, ταῦτα πληροῖ τὰ ληστηρία, ταῦτ’ εἰς τὸν ἐπακροκέλητα ἐμβιβάζει, κ. τ. λ. And, a little after : οὐ γὰρ τὴν αἰσχύνην, οὐδ’ ἃ πείσσονται λογίζονται, ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ οἷς κατορθώσαντες εὐφρανθήσονται, τούτοις κεκλήνται.

ἐξέλκυσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας. Examples of it are adduced by the Philologists. The term ἐξελκύω is used with nouns denoting *pleasure, habit, custom*, &c. Rosenm. compares from Virgil: Trahit sua quemque voluptas. In δελεάζ. there is a metaphor taken from *fishing*, common in the Classical writers, from whom Wets. adduces many examples.* It is truly remarked by the Commentators that the image (which is not unlike one in Milton) is derived *a meretrice*. (See Carpz.)

15. εἶτα—ἀμαρτίαν. Now evil concupiscence *conceives*, when we *foster* it in our minds, and take pleasure in it. For then does actually follow meditated sin, as parturition follows conception. (Rosenm.) Συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει is for συλλαβάνει καὶ τίκτει. On the term συλλαμβ., scil. ἐν γαστρὶ, see Luke 1, 31., and 2, 21. Of τίκτειν, in this sense, there are numerous examples in the Classical writers. Ἀποτελεσθεῖσα, *when fully accomplished, perpetrated*. So Polyb., ἀσέβημα ἀπετέλεσαν.

The ἀμαρτία must be taken in a *general* sense: and the best commentary on the ἀποκύει θάνατον, is Rom. 6, 21., ὡν τὸ τέλος θάνατος, i. e. death, punishment, and misery. Pott compares Philo, p. 147 E. Ἡ φύσις πρὸς γένεσιν πραγμάτων ᾤρισεν ἐν ψυχῇ δύναμιν, δι' ἧς κυφορεῖ, καὶ ᾠδινεῖ καὶ ἀποτίκτει πολλά διανοία τῶν δὲ ἀποκυομένων—τὰ δῆλεα—ἐστὶ κακία καὶ πάθος. I add Æschyl. Pers. 826., ὕβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσα ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν Ἄτης, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξαμᾶ θέρος. Laonid. Alex. ap. Brunck Anal. 2, 190., ὕμεας ἀφροσύνην μαιώσατο, τόλμα δ' ἔτικτε καὶ ἀφροσύνην. Plato Epist. 3., βλάβην ἡδονῇ—γεννᾷ—δυσμαθίαν καὶ λήθην καὶ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ὕβριν τίκτει.

16, 17. These verses are closely connected together, and contain perhaps an inference from the preceding. The erroneous doctrine in question the Apostle opposes, by showing that so far is God from being the author of evil, or men being impelled by him to sin, that

* The most apposite are the following, Athen. 308, 1., ἀνελκυσθεῖς δὲ οὐ δελεάζεται οὔτε σαρκὶ οὔτε ἄλλῳ τινι ἐμψυχον. Herod. 2, 70., Cic. de Senect. 13., Divinè enim Plato escam malorum voluptatem appellat, quod ea videlicet homines capiantur, ut hamo pisces. See more in Loesn., Schoettg., Alberti, and Carpz.

He is the only source of *good*. Now this he introduces with a formula employed by the sacred writers, when they wish to recall men from grievous though unperceived error ; as in 1 Cor. 6, 9. 15, 33. Gal. 6, 7., &c., where see the notes.

17. *πᾶσα δόσις*—τέλειον. The *πᾶσα* Raphel, Rosenm., and Pott, render *mera* (as a little before). But it is unnecessary to resort to such a sense. Τελ. is a somewhat stronger term than ἀγαθὸν. Ἀνωθὲν is for οὐρανόθεν (as Acts 14, 7.) So the Heb. למעלה. The term, of course, denotes *God in Heaven* : but this is expressed by the Apostle just after. Ἔστι κατ. So most Critics point. But others take the ἔστι κατ. for καταβαίνει. So the Vulg. Antiq. and Syr., James 3, 15. Joh. 1, 33. And this is more agreeable to the usage of the New Testament in mentioning what is *customary*. Ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων. It is plain that πατὴρ is here, like the corresponding words in most languages, put for *author, producer* : but it is not so easy to settle the sense of φώτων. Heinr. takes it of the Urim and Thummim. Wolf, Mede, Schleus., and Reich, of every sort of perfection and felicity. Grot., of *spiritual gifts*. Benson, of *revelation*. Some recent Commentators, as Semler, Teller, Storr, Rosenm., Meyer, Hottinger, Pott, &c., understand it of the *sun, moon, and stars* (nay, even the whole *universe*), like the Heb. יָוֹז. And this, they think, is required by what follows. See more in Pott and Slade. Upon the whole, this last interpretation may deserve the preference : but it is not impossible that a metaphorical as well as a physical sense is here intended.

The words following are, by Wets. and the best Commentators, thought to contain an astronomical allusion ; q. d. “ In Him is not, as in the sun (the greatest of corporeal lights), any *παραλλαγή*, τροπή, or ἀποσκίασμα ; all of these are astronomical terms, on which see Wets. and Schleus. Lex. But perhaps this may be too fanciful and far-fetched ; and I am inclined to think, with Rosenm., that *παραλλαγή* signifies any *change by turns* ; and the τροπή is synonymous ; and the τροπὴς ἀποσκίασμα signifies the *least sort* of turning.

The doctrine of this verse brings to mind the etymology of the term by which the Northern nations designate the Supreme Being, and which is derived from the adjective *good*.

18. βουλευθεὶς ἀπεκύσεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας. On the sense of βουλευθεὶς Commentators differ in opinion. Wets. renders it, “ sapientissimo atque optimo consilio.” But this signification is devoid of authority. Others render, “ suâ sponte et ultra, nullis meritis nostris permotus.” But such a sense cannot fairly be elicited from the words. I prefer, with Benson, Mich., Carpzov, Mackn., and Rosenm., to interpret it, sua sponte, benignitate mentis, pro gratiâ et benevolentîâ suâ. Perhaps the above senses may be conjoined. Carpzov aptly compares Eph. 1, 5. κατὰ

τὴν εὐδοκίαν θελήματος αὐτοῦ. See his examples of *βούλομαι* to denote *liking* and *desire*.

It is well observed, by Benson and Mackn., that “we have here the genealogy of righteousness. All the righteous deeds which men perform proceed from their renewed nature. Their nature is renewed by the power of truth (by the truths of the Gospel through the operation of the Spirit), and God is the prime mover in the whole.”

The ἀπεκύησεν (i. e. ἀναγενν.) has reference to our *spiritual regeneration* by the Gospel to eternal life; with an allusion (as Hardy observes) to our *adoption*, on which see Joh. 1, 12 & 13. and 1 Joh. 5, 18. “Now the change (observes Mackn.) which God produces in men’s dispositions and actions, by the truths of the Gospel impressed on their minds, is so great, that it may be called a *begetting* or *creating* them anew.”

By the λόγῳ ἀληθείας is meant the *Gospel*; as 1 Pet. 1, 23. So Jaspis, whom see.

18. εἰς τὸ—κτισμάτων.

The term ἀπαρχὴ denotes, properly, the *first portion taken of any thing*; and since that was usually the portion appropriated to showing honour to man, or reverence to God (see Num. 18, 12. Deut. 21, 17. and Gen. 49, 3.), so it came to mean the *first* of any thing. The sense assigned by Bengel, Mackn., Rosenm., and Pott, is as follows: “ut simus primi ac præcipui omnium mortalium.” They refer to the Schol. Medic. and to the Schol. on Eurip. Or. 96. Thus it will denote the *Jews*: and Slade thinks the Apostle meant to remind his Jewish brethren that they were the peculiar people of God whom he had chosen as instruments of preserving the true religion ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, and who were especially and primarily called to embrace and to promulgate the benefits of the Gospel. Luke 24, 47. Rom. 11, 16. Eph. 1, 12. 2 Thess. 2, 13. In this view, therefore, they might be truly and emphatically denominated the first fruits of creation, i. e. of all those who should be ultimately made partakers of the blessings of Divine revelation.” Others, as Doddr., Noesselt, and Jaspis, think the sense is, that they should be first numbered among the congregation. See Rom. 16, 5.

19, 20. ὥστε—ὀφείλην.

The ὥστε is for διὰ or διὰ τοῦτο, “such being the case; since, by the true doctrine, we have become such as to be numbered with the most precious of God’s creatures, we ought with alacrity to learn this salutary doctrine, and so to learn that we may be reformed and

made better men." This position, that the Gospel ought not only to be *learned*, but *practised*, the Apostle now especially dwells on up to the end of the second chapter. (Storr and Rosenm.) It is remarked, by Carpzov, that the Apostle takes occasion from what has been hitherto said *specially*, to give a *general* admonition.

The best Commentators are agreed that *ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι* (with which they compare Sir. 5, 11. *γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει*) signifies, *hear the word of truth* just mentioned, namely the Gospel. And they render *λαλῆσαι* *teach*; a signification elsewhere found. "Now it was (Benson observes) the temper of the Jews to be very impatient in hearing others, even when speaking on religious subjects; and yet very apt to assume authority to themselves, and to set up for teachers." And such, indeed, they have been in all ages. This interpretation, however, seems harsh. It should rather appear that the Apostle has in view discussions and disputations upon points of doctrine.*

The *ὀργήν* is usually rendered *wrath*, by which Benson understands *resentment against God* as the author of our trials and afflictions. But this seems not agreeable to what follows. I therefore prefer, with Carpzov, Rosenm., and Pott, to take it to denote an *impatient, hot-headed spirit, immoderate fervour* in discussing points of religious doctrine. But I cannot agree, with some eminent recent Commentators, that *teachers* only are meant; and that this admonition is intended to check their excessive zeal. It should rather appear to be meant for those who *set up for teachers*, and were too pragmatical and dogmatising: errors likely enough to arise under the present circumstances. This sense of *ὀργή* is frequent in the best writers, especially Thucydides.

Many examples of similar antithesis between *ταχὺς* and *βραδὺς* are adduced by Wets.; and I had myself collected not a few: but it is unnecessary to introduce any.

20. *ὀργή γὰρ—κατεργάζεται.* The Commentators above mentioned here explain: "an angry man does not act agreeably to the precepts of religion, and therefore cannot teach:" which is very true, but not (I think) *the* truth intended by the Apostle, who seems to have meant to say, that such a vehement, intemperate, intolerant, and disputatious a spirit was not calculated to promote the cause of true religion. And this is nearly the sense assigned by Whitby, Dodd., and Mackn. The *subject* is well illustrated by Benson.

21. *διὸ ἀποθέμενοι—κακίας.* The sense of this and

* On this subject the Philological Commentators supply us with abundance of Classical illustrations. The rule of Pythagoras will readily occur: but whether the Apostle had it in view is very doubtful. It is observed, by Benson, that the antient philosophers have taken notice, "that men have two ears, and but one tongue, that they should hear more than they speak. And likewise, that the ears are always open, ever ready to receive instruction; but the tongue is surrounded with a double row of teeth, to hedge it in, and keep it within proper bounds."

the following verses depends upon that of the preceding. According to the interpretation above adopted, the *ῥυπαρίαν* will not denote *vice* and *immorality* (as most Interpreters explain it), but be taken for *βλασφημίαν* and *αἰσχρολογίαν*, i. e. such ill language as intemperate disputation usually engenders. And the *περισσ. κακίας* is not ill explained by Rosenm. *nimia morositas*. I should, however, prefer *petulantia*: for that *teachers* are not here especially meant is plain from the following words *ἐν πραύτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον*, of which the sense is: “receive and entertain with a meek and mild spirit, and not with a violent and intemperate one, that engrafted word which is *able* (and is *meant*) *to save your souls*, (not to supply matter for mere animal and carnal contention).” The *ἔμφυτος λόγος* is referred, by the Commentators, to that figure by which the Gospel committed to the mind is compared to *seed* sown in the ground. It is opposed, Carpzov observes, to instruction which is not retained in the memory, but merely strikes the ears, and takes no root in the mind.” There seems also an allusion to what went before, namely, *λόγος ἀληθείας ᾧ ἀπεκύησεν ὁ Πατήρ*. The Apostle (I conceive) means to hint that we are the more bound to use the Gospel for the purpose it was intended to serve, since it is an *ἔμφυτος λόγος*, one not natural to the human heart, but implanted there for the most benevolent ends. I would compare Julian de Regno (speaking of the works of Plato) *λόγοι καὶ θρέψαι ψυχὴν ξὺν ἡδονῇ καὶ καθάραι δύνανται*.

22. *γίνεσθε δὲ—ἐαυτοὺς*. *Ποιήτης*, in the Classical writers, signifies the maker or author of any thing. It here denotes, emphatically, one who performs and puts in practice the injunctions of the Gospel, and does not rest content with *hearing* them only. For it is not sufficient, nor indeed of any avail, for a man to know the truth, if he do not obey and follow it in his life and conduct.

Then is suggested a *reason* for this; namely, that

by being barely *hearers*, they will but deceive *themselves*, and not attain the expected reward. See ver. 26 & 27. and Matt. 7, 21. Such, I conceive, is the sense: though most Commentators take the words to advert to the case of the *hypocrite*. But the hypocrite cannot be said to deceive *himself*; though he may deceive *others*: and as the subject is the necessity of *practice* rather than theory, the former interpretation seems preferable.

The Philological Commentators, as Elsn., Munthe, and others, compare similar sentiments in the Classical. Thus Porphy. de Abstin. p. 99. δι' ἔργων ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία, οὐ δι' ἀκροάσεως λόγων φιλήσ. Seneca, Ep. 108 & 75. See more in Pott.

23, 24. ἔοικεν—ἐσόπτρῳ. Ἀνδρὶ (which answers to the Heb. שׂוֹמֵר) is for *τινι*, *any one*, of either sex. Κατανοεῖν here signifies to *contemplate*, *behold*. Τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως. The τῆς γενέσεως is thought, by some, a Hebrew pleonasm. And thus it is omitted by the Syr. But it seems better, with Grot. and Rosenm., to take it for γνήσιον, *real*, *natural*. Thus the πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως is equivalent to τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ προσώπου ὁμοίαν; as in Artemid. On. 2, 7. κατοπτρίζεσθαι δὲ καὶ ὁρᾶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνα ὁμοίαν ἐν κατόπτρῳ ἄγαθον, &c. The *καταν.* is, by Pott and Rosenm., rightly taken of a hasty, casual, and transient glance. Pott paraphrases thus: “formam vultûs nativam transeundo animadvertit, suppl. non item maculas vultui haud ἐκ γενέσεως insitas, sed propriâ culpâ adspersas, ad quas animadvertendas παρακύψει v. 25. sive accuratiori vultûs exploratione opus erat.” So also Mackn. But this seems too far-fetched; and I agree with Hamm. and Slade, that it only refers to a transient, casual, and careless glance. See Slade in loc. The κατανόησε—ἦν, Rosenm. observes, is for κατανόησας γὰρ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ἀπελθὼν, εὐθέως ἐπιλανθάνεται ὁποῖος ἦν, i. e. “He who takes only a transient glance at his image, sees not any dirt on his visage, and so neglects to wipe it off.” See a similar passage in Philostr. V. Ap. 8, 26. p. 367.

25. ὁ δὲ παρακύψας—παραμείνας.

Παρακύπτειν plainly signifies to stoop down by any thing in order to examine it; and, in a general way, to attentively consider. - It is not, however, so easy to determine the sense of νόμον τῆς ἐλευθερίας, which is variously explained. By Grot., Wells, Benson, and Mich., it is understood of *deliverance from the ceremonial law*. "The law of God (say they), as it subsists in the Gospel, is called *perfect*, on account of its superiority to the law of Moses, and is here compared to a *mirror*, because it shows every man the temper and disposition of his mind, and what is its complexion and colour, just as a mirror shews him the features and colour of his face. And it is called a law of liberty, 1st, Because it delivers men from the slavery of their lusts; 2dly, Because it hath freed the Jews from the yoke of Moses, which was a yoke of bondage; 3dly, Because it delivers all true believers from the punishment of sin." But νόμον has not the article; and the words following plainly require a far more general sense. See Pott. Others, as Carpzov, would take ἐλευθερίας for σωτηρίας. "For those (says he) whom the Son freeth are indeed liberated (Joh. 8, 36.). So that the νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας is the excellent doctrine of the Gospel, which liberates us from the curse of the law, from bondage to sin, and fear of punishment, and which confers eternal felicity." In nearly the same way it is explained by Pott and Rosenm. The νόμος τῆς ἐλευθερίας, Rosenm. says, is that doctrine which liberates us from the dominion of vices and lusts (as Joh. 8, 31 & 32.), which St. James, throughout his whole Epistle, exhorts them to guard against and avoid." This νόμος, or doctrine (he adds), is called τέλειον, with reference to the whole as taken conjointly, and not separately; and also, in comparison with the imperfection of the Mosaic Law. Περιμένειν signifies to *persevere*, as those do who survey their faces for the purpose of decoration.

25. οὗτος οὐκ ἀκροατῆς—ἔσται. He who forgets not what he has learnt, but *does* it, shall obtain this freedom which the Gospel promises." The genitive ἐπιλησμονῆς is for the adjective ἐπιλησμων. "Ἔργου. The whole system of works is here considered as *one*, i. e. the doing the will of God. See Wells. The repetition of οὗτος has great energy. Οὗτος μακάριος. Carpzov thinks there is an allusion to Ps. 32. 'Εν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ, sub. τοῦ νόμου, on account of (ב) what he does, his obedience to the Gospel, his ἔργον.

26. εἴ τις δοκεῖ—αὐτοῦ: The Apostle here brings the charge home, plainly alluding (though with delicacy) to some among them who were of this description. The words are rightly rendered by the Vulg.: "Si quis putat se religiosum esse," &c. For, as Rosenm. remarks, εἰ αὐτῷ is to be understood. Here,

as before, conceit and spiritual pride is designated, and not *hypocrisy*. See Carpzov. Θρησκος is for θρησκευτής. This is a rare signification, but noticed by Hesych., who explains the term by εὐσεβής, δεισιδαίμων. Μὴ χαλιναγαγῶν γλῶσσων αὐτοῦ, “bridleth not his tongue,” namely, from the linguæ intemperantiâ spoken of at ver. 19—21., where see the note. Ἀλλ’ ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, sub. ἐστι (as Heb. 12, 15. ὑστερῶν, sub. ἦ). So Carpzov, who (with Benson) refers the words to the *predicate*, not the *subject*. Nor need the ἀπ. be referred to χαλ., but ἀλλὰ may be rendered *sane, profecto*, ἰσχυρ. And so in Rom. 6, 5. Carpzov, however, remarks on the frequency of the *asyndeton* in St. James’s style, which runs through the whole of c. 5. The ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ is to be understood as the παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς supra, ver. 22. The metaphor in χαλιναγαγῶν is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. See Wets., to whose examples I add Theodorides ap. Brunck Anal. 2, 42. fin. Pollux, 6, 146. Philostr. V. A. 4, 30. Eurip. Hel. 1388. & Orest. 10. Eurip. Antiop. frag. 10. Aristoph. Ran. 838.

26. τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία, “is vain and inefficacious, not genuine, imaginary, and will never profit him any thing.”

27. θρησκεία—πατρί. Having told them what is *not* true religion, he bids them know what *is*, and in what it consists. “True and genuine religion, such as is acceptable to God, who is our Father (or “to God, even our Father,” or “to our God and Father”), &c. See Carpzov. In καθαρὰ and ἀμίαντος Rosenm. recognizes a metaphor taken from *pearls*, or *gems*, which should be pure, and without stain. Παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, “in the judgment of God.” This sense of παρὰ is frequent in the Classical writers. At τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί must be understood ἡμῶν. And αὕτη is for τοιαύτη. It is by some thought to be redundant; but, in reality, like all such pronouns demonstrative, adds to the strength of the sentence.

27. ἐπισκέπτεσθαι—κόσμου. This, Carpzov. ob-

serves, is not meant as a complete designation of true religion, but some *specimens* are adduced : so that there seems to be an ellipsis of *καὶ τὰ ὅμοια* or *καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*. But this appears too arbitrary. It is better to suppose, with Grot. and Rosenm., that the Apostle describes true religion by two of its principal effects, *beneficence* and *purity of life*; the *species* being put for the *genus*; as Matt. 25, 34. Ἐπισκεπτ. signifies, in a general way, to visit for the purpose of condolence, comfort, conversation, and personal relief. So Sir. 4, 10. γίνου ὁφθαλμοῖς ὡς πατὴρ, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς τῷ μητρὶ αὐτῶν, i. e. τῷ χήρᾳ. By the κόσμου some understand the affairs of the world, its riches, honours, and pleasures. But this savours of monkery. The best Commentators are agreed that it signifies (as often) the men of the world, worldlings, profane persons. From these, then, and from society with them, and from any participation in their vices, we are to keep ourselves pure. See 1 Joh. 2, 15 & 16. 2 Pet. 2, 18—20.*

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίας ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν—δόξης. From exhortation to benevolence and care of the poor, the Apostle proceeds to warn them against a practice, the opposite to Christian benevolence, namely, that invidious preference of the rich over the poor in their religious assemblies. But to proceed to the words themselves, some (as Mackn.,

* On this and the preceding Slade refers to Paley's Serm. 21. I would also refer to an equally excellent Sermon of Dr. Maltby, vol. 1., from which I must content myself with introducing the following extract. "Vital religion, therefore, cannot be separated from practical religion : and in vain will a man seem to be religious, by the profession of faith and the observance of external ceremonies, unless to that which is done in honour of God be superadded that which is done for the happiness of man. Religion, then, unites piety with benevolence : it is to do good, and to be good ; and what may not be included in this definition is not essential to, nay, may be repugnant to, the spirit of true religion."

Storr, and Rosenm.) take $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\nu$ — $\delta\acute{o}\xi\eta\varsigma$ interrogatively, and regard $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ as put for $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$, i. e. “Can you, if you be led by partiality, be accounted as true worshippers of our Lord?” &c. This, however, is surely doing violence to the words. Almost all other Commentators agree in regarding the $\mu\eta$ as *prohibitive*. At the same time, they differ in the interpretation of the words; and certainly the sense is of no easy determination. Pott resolves the phraseology thus: $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ (i. e. $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi$.) $\tau\eta\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\psi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\nu$ (i. e. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$) $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$, “do not, now you are Christians, retain that preference of rich persons to which you were formerly addicted.” But this cannot be admitted as either the true construction, or the real sense. Other interpretations I must omit. The sense seems simply to be this: “Do not hold or profess the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ in (i. e. with) the practice of undue respect of persons.” It is rightly remarked, by Carpzov, that $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ here simply signifies “the profession of the Gospel, or the Christian religion,” (as 1 Tim. 3, 9., where see the note), with which $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi$. is inconsistent. See Jaspis.

$\tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{o}\xi\eta\varsigma$ is by some taken for $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\delta\acute{o}\xi\omicron\upsilon$ (as 2 Cor. 3, 9.); by others (as the Syr.) united with $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; by others, again, joined with $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi$. The *first* is the most natural interpretation, and, as Carpz. observes, there may be an allusion to his *glory* as *Son of God* (see Joh. 1, 14. 2, 11.); but the second may be admitted, and make no material difference in the sense.

2—4. $\epsilon\grave{\alpha}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ — $\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\tau\iota$, “If, for instance,” &c.

$\Sigma\nu\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta\nu$, *religious assembly*; that appellation being yet, it seems, in use; though this is the only place in the New Testament where it occurs; yet we have $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\nu\alpha\gamma$. at Hebr. 10, 25. where see the note. Benson thinks the Apostle makes use of the term, as writing to *Jews*. Nay, Rosenm. observes (referring to Vitringa de Syn. Vet. 1, 3, 2.), that the synagogues themselves of the Jews were sometimes dedicated to Christian worship. So also Horneius Expos. in loc. But this must have been very rare, and only when nearly all the congregation had become Christians; and, in the *general* way the Apostle speaks, cannot be thought of. I agree with

Carpz. in understanding solely a Christian place of worship ; though it is probable that when such were regular edifices, their plan was very similar to that of the synagogues ; and when, on the other hand, they were mere rooms in private houses, the Jewish practice of providing appropriate seats for the more honourable, prevailed.

Ἀνὴρ, a person, whether Christian, Jew, or Heathen : for to *all* access was granted ; as we learn from 1 Cor. 14, 25. Χρυσοδακτύλιος, “ one who wears a ring,” or rather *rings* ; for *many* such, we find by the Philological Commentators, were worn by the rich. Λαμπρᾶ, magnificent, splendid. Πτωχός, a poor man, whether Christian, or otherwise. Ῥυπαρὰ ἐσθῆτι, “ sordid shabby clothes.” Ἐπιβλέψετε is for ἀποβλ. (as ἐφορᾶν and *suspicere, adspicere, &c.* see Palaiet and Krebs), “ look at with the attention and preference which dress will not fail to attract.” Φοροῦντα, “ who wears, is dressed in.” Σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς, i. e. *commode, or honoratè*. Rosenm. cites Ælian V. H. 2, 13. ; ἐν καλῷ τοῦ Θεάτρον καθῆσθαι Ὑποπόδιον, *foot-stool*. All this supposes a similar distinction of seats to that prevailing in the synagogues. On the *mode* in which this may be supposed to have taken place Commentators variously speculate ; and in so doubtful a manner nothing can be determined.

4. καὶ οὐ διεκρίθητε—πονηρῶν ; On the construction, punctuation, and sense of this verse Commentators are divided. Many, from the Syr. downwards, take the sentence *interrogatively* ; and unite διεκρίθητε with the verb suspended on ἐὰν γὰρ, ascribing to διεκ. the sense *make a distinction*. But this yields an objectionable sense ; and grammatical principles forbid us to suppose an interrogation. See Slade. I therefore agree with the best recent Commentators in supposing that there is *none* : but I can scarcely accede to the opinion of Elsner and Slade, that there is a forensic metaphor in διεκρ. ; for that would be forced, and little agreeable to the context. It seems better to understand it (with Carpz., Storr, Pott, and Rosenm.,) of *private judgment* (and consequent preference) on wrong grounds.

4. ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is for ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν ; as Mark 11, 23. It is rightly observed by Rosenm., that κριταὶ is used of those qui discernunt, vel æstimant : and that the genitive διαλ. is not of *object*, but *attribute*, by an Hebraism ; “ Ye judge according to false reasonings ; ye are judges who reason ill,” namely, by judging of any one's worth by his apparel. In διεκρίθητε we have the passive for the middle.

5. The Apostle now proceeds to show how *unjust* is such partiality ; since those very poor persons whom they despise, are especially dear to and accepted by God ; while the rich, whom they so highly honour, are the very persons by whom the Christians are most oppressed. (Pott.)

5. ἀκούσατε—αὐτόν ; “ hear and attend,” &c. The ὡχ is interrogative. Ἐκλέξασθαι, like the Hebrew

בְּחֶרֶץ, signifies to especially approve and love. The sense is *not*, I conceive, (as many Commentators explain,) that God shows impartiality, by loving the poor *as well as* the rich, but that he loves and approves of them *more*; and that, because they are better fitted to perform the duties of Christians, and are not entangled in the temptations which beset the path of the rich, of the difficulty of whose salvation our Lord so awfully speaks. It is observed by Rosenm., that the *first* argument is deduced from the dissimilarity of God's judgment to that of men. The πλουσίους ἐν πίστει he renders: "if they be rich in faith." But this seems too arbitrary. It should rather seem that the whole sentence is elliptical; and its sense may be thus expressed: "Does not God view with especial approbation the poor, (the poor, I say, in respect to this world's goods, but) rich in the treasures of faith and religion, even heirs of the kingdom," &c. Τοῦ κόσμου, "in the sight of this world," or, "in worldly possessions." Πίστις here, as often, signifies the *Christian religion*, the *Gospel*, which is not unfrequently compared to a *treasure*. At κληρ. Pott supplies ὥστε εἶναι. The other terms have been before explained. On the Gospel's being first preached to the poor, see the notes of Benson, Mackn., and Slade, which last Commentator's remarks, however, on ἀγάπῳ αὐτὸν are ill founded; since this is a mere *formula* expressive of devout obedience. Far more judicious in his concluding remark, that "the Apostle only means that the Gospel was preached especially to the poor; because they generally possessed a spirit more favourable to its reception; and in order to show that its blessings and privileges were universal, that the rich had no right to that distinction and ascendancy which they were always so ready to usurp."

6, 7. The first clause ὑμεῖς—πτωχόν ought to have been thrown to ver. 5. And so Œcumen. Indeed the δὲ seems to be adversative; q. d. "while God, on the one hand, so acts, ye, on the other, despise

the poor." Ἡτιμάσατε. Aorist for present, as expressive of custom and habit. Then follows (as Rosenm. observes) the *other* argument against this undue partiality, namely, that those to whom it is shown are the least worthy of it. And here the interrogation has great spirit. Καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν; "do they not imperiously lord it over you?" So the terms κατακυριεύω, κατεξουσιάζω, on which see Schleus. Lex. in V. and N. T. Such will apply to the rich in every age. Καὶ αὐτοὶ—κριτηρία: for καὶ οὐχὶ αὐτοὶ εἰσι οἱ ἐλκ. These rich are supposed by Rosenm. to have been of the *unbelieving* Jews, who accused the poorer Christians to the magistracy. But it is best to leave the sense unlimited, and understand the *rich of very sort*, both Christians, Jews, and Gentiles. Ἐλκ. denotes violent abduction, like σύγειν and *rapere*. So our *haul* and *hale*, which are derived from the same source.

7. οὐκ οὗτοι—ὑμᾶς; βλασφην., *defame, speak reproachfully and insultingly of*. Ὄνομα, Rosenm. observes, is here, as often, used for *person*, and *Christ* is obviously meant; and the καλὸν signifies *venerable, august*. Thus τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς will be for ἐξ οὗ ἐπικαλεῖσθε or ἐπικλησιν ἔχετε. The sense, then, is, that they reject Christ as an impostor, and heap curses on him. Others, however, as Pott, object, that thus a *person* is said ἐπικαλεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τινα. And they understand the *name of Christians*, which was first given at Antioch; rendering the τὸ ἐπὶ κληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, "after whom ye are called;" as Gen. 48, 16. 1 Kings 8, 16. Is. 4, 1. It is not material which of these interpretations be adopted; but the former seems the more natural, and such an hypallage is very common. Carpz. and Storr, supposing the *rich* here mentioned to be *Christians*, understand the βλασφ. of causing the name of Christ and his religion to be disgraced by their unworthy conduct. But this seems too harsh.

8, 9. εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικόν.

Now the Jews, with undeviating hostility to Christians, showed

an especial zeal for the *Mosaic Law*. To these therefore the Apostle opposes the sum and bulwark of *universal law*; as Christ, Matt. 22, 34. seq. and St. Paul, Gal. 5, 14. and Rom. 13, 9. (Rosenm.) On the sense of νόμον βασιλικόν there has been some difference of opinion. The best Commentators, however, are agreed that as βασιλικός so often denotes what is *principal* and most excellent (as in several passages cited by Wets. from Plato, Arist., Xenophon, and Aristid., and also Philo, (the imitator of Plato,) cited by Carpz.: βασιλικώτερον οὐδὲν τῆς ἀρετῆς; so νόμος βασιλ. may signify that which is most excellent, and worthy of God, or, as Doddr. explains, "that which ought, with a kind of imperial authority to govern all our sentiments;" what Christ calls, Matt. 22, 39. ἐντολὴν πρώτην καὶ μεγάλην; and St. Paul, the πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου, the *primary and most consummate precept*, Rom. 13, 10. Gal. 5, 14. Slade thinks the expression may denote the supreme and indispensable obligation of this law, and its pre-eminence above every other; inasmuch as it governs and includes all the duties which belong to the second table—that law which (as Wells observes) is of *principal* regard with respect to our duty to our neighbour.

Κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν, namely, Levit. 19, 18.

9 εἰ δὲ—παράβηται, "But if we show *προσωποληψία*, &c. Προσωποληπτεῖν is a term scarcely ever found elsewhere. See the note on ver. 1. Ἀμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε, for ἀμαρτάνειν, like the Hebr. הִפְסִיךְ. Ἐλεγχόμενοι, "since ye are convicted." A nominativus pendens. In the phraseology here there is something unusual. The sense is: "ye are convicted as transgressors of the law." By the νόμ. some think is meant *a law*, namely, that at Levit. 19, 18. Others, with more probability, understand the *royal law* just mentioned, which (as Rosenm. observes) is violated by all undue respect of persons, or unjust partiality.

10, 11. ὅστις γὰρ—ἔνοχος. By the *whole law* St. James means the Law of Moses. Yet he hints that the same holds good of the law of the *Gospel*; a truth indeed admitted by all. Here is adduced the *reason* why ὁ προσωπολήπτης may be rightly termed a παραβάτης νόμου. Whosoever (it is said) shall keep all other precepts, but violate *one*, namely, one which involves capital punishment, he is held guilty of all, and is punished with death, the same as if he had violated *all* the precepts of the law. And so the Rabbins have: "He who transgresses one precept, it is as if he transgressed all." The *transgression* here meant is *deliberate* and *wilful* transgression. Πταίειν ἐν ἐνὶ signifies literally *to stumble at, trip up, fall, sin*, &c. At ἡ must be understood λόγῳ "one article of the law." (Rosenm.) The *reason* of this

denunciation is, as all Commentators admit, obvious; namely, since he who wilfully violates *one*, at the same time tramples on the *authority* by which *all* are enjoined; and this setting at nought the authority of the Legislator, of course, draws with it the severest penalty he can inflict. The saying of Draco will readily occur. For the rest it may suffice to refer the reader to Beza, Whitby, and Grot., or Slade. "Ενοχος (from ἐνέχεσθαι), "liable to the punishment of;" as 1 Cor. 11, 27. where see the note; and see also the note on Matt. 26, 67.

11. ὁ γὰρ—νόμου. Grot. and Rosenm. aptly cite Salvianus: "Si enim pro arbitrio suo servi dominis obtemperarent, ne in iis quidem in quibus obtemperaverint obsequuntur. Quando enim servus ex Domini sui jussis ea facit tantummodo, quæ vult facere, jam non dominicam voluntatem implet, sed suam."

12. οὕτω λαλεῖτε—κρίνεσθαι. "Always remember ye then so to speak, and so to act, as those who are to be judged by a law of liberty." The only difficulty here is to determine the meaning of the νόμου ἐλευθερίας, which is explained by Carpz. as equivalent to νόμος ἐλευθερῶν, in opposition to νόμος κατακρίνων, i. e. "So speak and so act that ye may be absolved in that divine judgment, and not be condemned." But I see no reason to abandon the usual interpretation, by which it is explained: the law and doctrine which frees us both from the ceremonial law and the tyranny of sin, and the punishment thence resulting (see Rom. 8, 2.); q. d. "a severe judgment shall he experience who transgresses this νομ. βασιλικ'. Διὰ νόμου is for κατὰ νόμον. It is remarked by Rosenm.: "Ergo sermonibus et actibus, amore plenis πίστις νόμου ἐλευθερίας comprobanda est." Wets. observes, that on *works* the Apostle treats to the end of the chapter; on *words*, c. 3. 1.

13. ἡ γὰρ κρίσις—ἔλεος, "For judgment without mercy (shall be) to him who hath shown no mercy and pity." Κρίσις carries with it the idea of severe

punishment; and the ἔλεος, ἦ, must be understood of all the offices of humanity, love, and beneficence to others. See Matt. 9, 13. and the note. To this the Apostle subjoins κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως, the sense of which is obscure: but it does *not* (as Mr. Slade supposes) depend upon what reading is adopted; since κατακαυχᾶσθω of the Alexandrian and two other MSS. has no semblance of truth, and is a mere *emendation*. Retaining then (as we ought) the common reading, the sense will be, according to Carpz., as follows: “He who obeys this law, despises judgment, and fears it not. The merciful man looks for every thing *good* from his merciful Father.” And so Rosenm.: “Beneficence triumphs over condemnation, and fears it not. God will not condemn the imitators of his own goodness.” Other virtues (he adds) are not excluded; but only the force of beneficence is set forth. Compare Rom. 13, 8—10. Perhaps, however, the sense of the words may be as follows: “The merciful man may venture, with holy confidence, to meet judgment, trusting that that virtue will serve to mitigate the severity of the divine wrath.” Pott compares Demosth. adv. Med. Οὐδείς γὰρ ἐστὶ δίκαιος τυγχάνειν ἔλεου, τῶν μὴδὲνα ἐλεούντων, οὐδὲ συγγνώμης, τῶν ἀσυγγνωμόνων.

14. The Apostle now returns to the subject treated on at 1, 22—27., namely, that a *knowledge* only of religion, unaccompanied with good works, will be fruitless. This is urged in opposition to those Christians who too much gave in to the Jewish error, that profession of a covenanted religion was enough, without practice. So Jerome on Mic. 3, 5. “Promittunt eis pacem et regna cœlestia, et dicunt: non necesse est, ut vivas continenter et sanctè, habeto fidem quam docemus, et omnia promissa Domini consequeris.”

By πίστις is here meant such a faith as is not accompanied with works, an external and historical faith, a bare profession or assent to knowledge, like the ἀκρόασις at 1, 22. See Grot. and Carpz., or Slade. It is observed by Rosenm., that this passage would not have been by some thought at variance with the doctrine inculcated by

St. Paul, of obtaining remission of sins without works, and solely by Christ, if the scope of each Apostle had been attentively considered. "*Paul* (continues he) teaches us at Rom 3. that our former sins are remitted, and we *received into favour* (for that is the sense there of *δικαιοῦσθαι*) purely by *grace*, before we had conciliated the favour of God by any works of merit. On the other hand, *James* shows that faith (in its extended sense) is not genuine, nor truly such, unless accompanied by good works. Therefore the Apostles are not concerned with the same persons. For with the former *ὁ νόμος* is the *whole Jewish law*; and those against whom he disputes are *Jews*, who fancy that they alone ἐξ ἔργων νόμον, by the observance of the Mosaic law, are to be justified, to the exclusion of Pagans. So that in this whole discussion we are to keep the ἔργα νόμον and ἔργα ἐγαθὰ quite distinct; since in *James* ἔργα are words and deeds agreeable to the Christian religion (ver. 8.); and those against whom he was writing, were *Christians*, who separated faith from good works, and held a bare faith to be sufficient. But that *conduct* suitable to our profession is to be maintained, that St. *Paul* also teaches, Rom. 2, 13. c. 6., and in all his Epistles. The words of St. *James* may be illustrated from the arts exercised in common life, in which *theory* is dead, i. e. useless, if not carried into practice. So Philo, 430. Τίς ὄρησις εὐφώνου ἡσυχάζοντος, ἢ μὴ αὐλουντος αὐλητοῦ, ἢ κιθαριστοῦ μὴ κιθαρίζοντος, ἢ συνόλως τεχνίτου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν τέχνην μὴ ἐνεργοῦντος; ἢ γὰρ ἀνευ πράξεως θεωρία ψιλὴ οὐδὲν ὄφελος τοῖς ἐπιστήμοσιν. Finally, the false opinion of *faith only* being available to salvation, was very prevalent among the Jews, who supposed that every Israelite who only held the profession of Judaism, would at last have part in the other world: and this St. *James* refutes." The most satisfactory information on this interesting subject may be obtained from the admirable Dissertation of Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost., and also the notes of Whitby and Doddr.

15, 16. εἰν δὲ ἀδελφὸς—ὄφελος; The Apostle now illustrates the thing by a familiar comparison, or simile, to this purpose: "As good *words* do not profit the needy to whom they are addressed, even though accompanied with *good will*; so neither does faith, destitute of good works, benefit the believer." (Rosenm.) Γυμνοὶ, *ill clothed*; as Matt. 25, 31. Λειπόμενοι ὥσι τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς. A designation of extreme poverty, denoting those who cannot obtain food for the day which is passing over their heads. Ὑπάγετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ. A common form of *farewell*, or *good-by*. So Grot. Θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε. These are deponent and reflected verbs, and and import: "go warm yourselves (with clothing),

and satisfy yourselves with food." They also imply a *good wish* that they may have food and raiment. Θερμ. here denotes the warm of clothing; as Job. 31, 20. Ἐπὶ τῇ δειῇ τοῦ σώματος. Ἐπιτηδ. properly governs the dative; but sometimes, as here, the genitive; in which case it is considered as a *substantive*, like many neuter adjectives with the article. Τὶ τὸ ὄφελος; scil. ἐστὶ, "what is the use (of that to him)?" or, as some explain, "what is the use of such a mere *profession* of the Christian name?"

17. οὕτω καὶ—ἐαυτῇ, "So also faith, of itself, and unaccompanied by works, is dead and useless." A repetition, in other words, of the sentiment at ver. 14. Νεκρὸς here signifies *fruitless, ineffective, useless*. The καθ' ἑαυτῇ is by the Syr., Vulg., and most interpreters, taken to denote *sola*, i. e. if it be alone. Thus it will be pleonastic; and such redundances are not unfrequent in St. James. So Grot. and Carpz. Others, as Pott and Rosenm., take it to mean *per se*, לבד. And this seems preferable. For other interpretations the reader is referred to Pott. The *application* is obvious.

18. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις—ἔχω. The Apostle here furnishes his brethren with a dialogue, by way of argument against a man who should magnify his profession of religion, and not concern himself with its fruit. The words from ver. 18. to ver. 24. inclusive, are addressed by a practical to a mere professing Christian. (Slade.)

Various explications of this passage have been propounded, which may be seen in Pole, Wolf, Storr, Carpz., and Pott. But it is necessary first, that the *reading* be settled; for some copies have ἐκ; others, χωρὶς. The *former* is defended by Mill, who supposes the sense to be as follows: "Shew me thy faith by thy works: It is the only way thou canst show it: But, as thou hast no works to produce, thou never canst shew me thy faith: I will prove that I have faith by my works." (See also Doddr., Carpz., and Mackn., or the abstract of their expositions in Slade.) And this will be not unsuitable to the Apostle's argument. But the other reading, χωρὶς, which the E. V. follows, is far stronger in critical authority; and it is justly thought by the most eminent to yield a far more

apt sense. So Jaspis observes: "Hæc lectio acrius urget adversarium et tanquam aculeis pungit absona loquentem, atque vel ideo quod habet longè acutiorem et concinniores sententiam, est Jacobo dignior." Thus the Apostle proves the necessity of good works, by showing the impossibility of evincing the existence of faith without them. See Wells or Slade. So Knapp and Rosenm., after observing that the words are *ironical*, lay down the following sense: "Shew me now the excellence of thy faith (if thou canst) without works. I will not believe that the faith of which thou boastest, is worthy of the name, unless thou show it me *in re*, and by thy deeds."

19. σὺ πιστεύεις—φρίσσουσι. An example is now adduced, to confirm and illustrate the sentiment at ver. 17., in which it was denied that faith *alone* (i. e. without works) is available to salvation. Here is taken for granted the *first* article of belief (that there is a God and one God only), whence depends all faith in Christ. (Rosenm.)

19. καλῶς ποιῆς, "so far, so good." Καὶ φρίσσουσι, "shake and tremble while they believe; since to them it brings no hope of salvation, but "a fearful looking for of punishment, in proportion to their iniquity." See Wolf and Slade.

20—22. Now is illustrated the nature of genuine faith by the example of *Abraham*. Θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι, &c., "Shall I show thee by examples from the Scripture thou professest to believe, that my position is true?" Ἀνθρώπε κενέ, sub. φρενῶν, *foolish man*. So the Syr., *debilis*, Carpz., *levis* (See his note). It may mean *thoughtless*. Rosenm. (after Grot.) compares the רָקָא, *Raca*, Matt. 5, 22., the μαῦρος of Christ, Matt. 23, 17 & 19., and the ἀνόητος at Luke 24, 25., and Gal. 3, 1 & 3. He observes, that hence we may infer that the *general* use of such words is not forbidden, so much as the employing them from hatred and passionate feelings, unaccompanied with any desire to reform another; so Benson remarks, that some of the same words, or actions, may be right, or wrong, according to the temper of mind, or the principles, or views, from which they proceed. "Finally (continues he), when Christ and the Apostles use these, it is generally when a *whole class* is designated, not an *individual*."

21. Ἀβραάμ—Θουσιαστήριον; Δικαίωσθαι here signifies "to be approved, accepted, made meet for a reward." See Hebr. 11, 31., Ἀνενέγκας, "when he had offered up." For the actual *preparation* *so to do* is always considered, both in the Scriptural and Rabbinical writers, as a *real sacrifice* (see Hebr. 11, 4., and the note there). And, as Benson observes, in all cases, what we would do, if permitted, is regarded by God as if we actually did it.

On the supposed discrepancy between the doctrine of St. Paul and St. James, Rosenm. has the following remarks. "St. James has been by some thought to contradict the express words of St. Paul at Rom. 3, 28.; and it is not improbable that some vain persons did *abuse* the doctrine there taught. But suppose that there were some of the Christians to whom James wrote who abused the words of St. Paul on justification. Thus, St. James will not contradict *St. Paul*, but only a *false* explanation of his doctrine. Now, St. Paul (it must be observed), when disputing against the Judaizers, who imagined that, by an observation of the Mosaic Law, they might attain the reward of eternal felicity, as of *debt*, had said that no man, whether Jew or Gentile, can obtain acceptance, except by *Christ's* merits, not his own. Rom. 3, 25. But those *Christians* against whom St. James is disputing, were of the persuasion (as appears from the answer of the Apostle), that a person might be made partaker of eternal felicity, *πίστει, χωρὶς ἔργων* (*ἀγαθῶν*); and not only is salvation by Christ attained by no merit of our own, but there is even no need of reformation and acts of piety on our part. Now this never entered into St. Paul's thoughts. For, he plainly teaches, Rom. c. 6 & 8, that it is the great excellence of the Christian religion, that it imparts to us what the Law could not confer, namely, by liberating us from the dominion of depraved lusts, and exciting in our minds a desire of heavenly things, holy feelings, and the study of true virtue. Thus St. Paul and St. James entirely agree. The former, teaches that there is no longer any need of the Mosaic Law in order to obtain the favour of God, and attain unto moral reformation; that the Christian religion alone affords us all that is necessary to salvation; and that of this felicity we are made partakers by no merit of our own, but purely by grace. The latter, teaches that faith (i. e. a general profession of religion, or dependance on Christ for salvation) which is unaccompanied by good feelings and virtuous deeds, is not of the right stamp, but imaginary and fictitious. Now each Apostle illustrates his position by the example of Abraham, and each suitably to the subject on which he is treating.* Thus St. James does not deny that Abraham obtained the Divine favour by *faith*; but *this* he denies, that his faith was destitute of good works. Abraham rather showed his faith and reliance, by preparing to offer up his only son (by Sarah), if God had continued to require it. See Hebr. 9, 17. (Rosenm.)

22. βλέπεις ὅτι—αὐτοῦ, "Thou seest that his faith was subservient unto works," i. e. produced them. So the Syr.: "fides ejus auxilio fuit operibus suis." This use of *συνεργεῖν* for *ἐνεργεῖν* or *βοηθεῖν* is very uncommon; though some examples of it are adduced from Philo, by Loesner and others. It is remarked by Carpz.: "Professio pietatis, et actio Abrahami heroica, hæc duo si-

* The circumstance, Benson observes, of both Apostles fixing on the example of Abraham, gives great confirmation to the opinion of the antients, that St. James wrote this Epistle to rectify the mistakes of such as had misinterpreted the Epistles of St. Paul, concerning the doctrine of justification by faith.

mul conjungebantur et sibi succurrebant, neutra extabat sola." Καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) from his works (especially his sacrifice of his son) he showed the truth and purity of his faith." So τελειοῦσθαι, *to be acknowledged for perfect*, 2 Cor., 12, 9. Carpz. explains: "His religion was known to be genuine and pure, by being abundantly productive of good fruits." See the sensible note of Slade.

23. καὶ ἐπληρώθη—λέγουσα. Carpz. renders: "et confirmabatur quod dictum fuerat." For (he remarks) the words were said *before* the birth of Isaac, Gen. 15, 6. Ἡ γράφη is put, by metonymy, for the *passage of Scripture*. Ἐπληρώθη, "was found to be true;" or, "this commendation of his faith was confirmed by the event." So Benson ap. Slade remarks: "It does not follow, that every passage of Scripture was intended as a prophecy of that particular event by which it is said to be *fulfilled*. The Jews understood this and the like expressions in a great latitude, and often meant no more than that the passage was *verified*, that it might be *fitly accommodated* to the case in hand." καὶ ἐκλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, i. e. "he was accounted worthy of the Divine favour." See the note on Rom. 4, 3., καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη, i. e. "he was made the friend of God;" *calling* here standing for *state*, by a frequent Hebraism. It is plain that the Apostle has reference to Gen. 22, 16., Is. 41, 8., 2 Chron., 20. 7. Compare Gen. 18, 17. And Philo 281 E., has the very expression: μὴ ἐπικαλύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ τοῦ φίλου μου. And though the Hebr. has רֵעַ; yet, as Rosenm., remarks, that word is rendered, by the Sept., Esth. 2, 18., *friend*. See also Matt. 15, 2. I would compare Liban. 30. c., ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ παρὰ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι βεβιωκώς, ὁ τῷ Θεῷ φίλος.

24—26. Dropping the prosopopœia, the Apostle again speaks in his own person. See the note on ver. 21. The sense of ver. 24, is thus expressed by Rosenm.: "Hoc ergo dicit Apostolus: Ut, qui jam credidit, Deum habeat amicum et fautorem, non sufficere fidem suam, sed, si tempus detur et occasio requiritet, bona opera, qualia præstitit Abrahamus." On Rahab and the signification of πόρνη see the note

on Hebr. 11, 31. Οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη; “Was she not justified by her works, and thereby obtained the favour of God, by being alone preserved, and then united in marriage with an honourable person, Booz?” Ὑποδεξαμένη, “took them in (ὕπ.);” which implies kind treatment and hospitality. Ἀγγέλους, *spies*. Such they were with respect to the Israelites, as being sent to make report on their return; though they would have been otherwise called by the citizens of Jericho. Ἐκβαλοῦσα. This verb does not always import forcible ejection, but sometimes simply to *send forth*, or *away*; as Matt. 9, 25., Ἐτέρᾳ ὁδῷ, “a different one from that they entered.” For she let them down by the wall; and, as Rosenm. supposes, pointed out another way to reach their camp. But this is harsh and unnecessary. For further observations on the case see the parallel passage of Hebrews.

From all this the Apostle concludes that, as a lifeless carcase is not a man; so the faith which does not produce good works, is only the dead carcase of faith, and not the genuine Christian faith,—a very forcible simile. The sense of the words may be thus expressed: “For as the body, without the soul, is dead, and useless to all the functions of human existence, so faith without works is dead,” i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) does not produce what it ought to produce, a continuance of the Divine favour, and consequently eternal life. It is not vital, but useless to edification, and so fails of eternal salvation.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. The connection here (if any be meant) is so uncertain, that nothing can be decided. See however Pott.

1. μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι—ληψόμεθα. At these words many Commentators stumble. There seems to be here a popular mode of expression for, “Put

away from among you that evil of πολυδιδασκαλία.” Now, the evil of *many* aiming to be teachers, when *few* could be qualified, and when those *few* would discharge the office, and do the good required, better than *many*, is obvious.* Rosenm. explains διδασκ. *Bishops*. But it rather refers to the offices of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. What the Apostle here cautions them against, was a fault into which the Jews and, as may be seen, the Jewish Christians, were too apt to fall, namely, of a pragmatistical spirit, which aimed at teaching others, and setting them right. He seems also to have reference to self-appointed *censors* (to which indeed Carpz. confines the sense), whose zeal greatly exceeded their knowledge. See Benson and Pott.

Then is subjoined the *reason*: “for be ye well assured that we (such of us as are teachers) shall have a severer trial, and give a stricter account.” Such (I find) is the sense assigned by Pott (whom see); and it seems the most apt. Commentators, however, take the κρίμα for κατακρίμα, *condemnation*, and consequently *punishment*. But this requires the subaudition of the clause: “if we fail to discharge our office with fidelity, or are too censorious and hard upon the failings of others.” The *we* is explained by Rosenm. as used per κοίνωσιν. But it is not necessary to resort to that principle.

2. πολλὰ γὰρ πταίμεν ἅπαντες. Here is adduced the *reason* why a more severe judgment will be exercised on teachers; namely, since, as the governance of the tongue is difficult, so it is often not attained by them (Pott). This, however, seems very little to the purpose. Rosenm. explains: “as in many

* I would compare a most apposite passage of Thucyd. 6, 72., μέγα δὲ βλάψαι καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ τὴν πολυαρχίαν (ἦσαν γὰρ πεντεκαίδεκα οἱ στρατηγοὶ αὐτοῖς) τῶν τε πολλῶν τὴν ἄξύντακτον ἀναρχίαν. Also Plut. Camill. 18. s. f., οὐδενὸς δ' ἦττον ἐτάραττεν ἢ πολυαρχία τὰ πραττόμενα and Joseph. 172, 45., πολυαρχία γὰρ πρὸς τῷ τοῖς ὀξέως τί πράττειν, ἀνάγκην ἔχουσιν, ἐμποδίων εἶναι, καὶ βλάπτειν πέφυκε τοὺς χρωμένους.

things we all offend, so there is the greater danger of erring in the exercise of the office of teachers." But perhaps the Apostle here only adverts to that *secondary* sense couched in the διδασκ. just before, namely, that of *censors*, whom we familiarly call *set up teachers*. And such (I find) is the view taken by Benson, who paraphrases thus: "And as we are all liable to offend, more or less, we should be very cautious how we censure others, or affect such a station as will render our own faults so highly aggravated."

At πολλὰ must be understood κατὰ and μέρη, "in many respects;" or, as Pott and Rosenm. explain, it stands for πολλῶς, *often*. This was a sort of common phrase, or proverb, of which Wets. adduces several examples. Πταίειν signifies, properly, to *trip*, but, often, to *offend*, *sin*, (see Benson ap. Slade), of which sense numerous examples are given by Wets.

2. εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ, "If there be any man who does not even sin in words, he will be a perfect man." "But (observes Rosenm.) the Apostle has just said that there is no such person." It is not, however, necessary to rigorously to interpret the τέλειος, nor is this permitted by the words following. We must understand it of that *comparative* perfection to which good men are permitted to attain." So Carpz. explains: "He has made a great progress in virtue." And so also Beausobre and Doddr. Now the man who has attained to this, it is added, is able χαλιναγωγῆσαι ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, "to hold in subjection the other members," since he can govern the tongue, which is managed with the *greatest* difficulty; and, therefore, as Benson adds in his paraphrase, such an one is fittest to instruct the ignorant, and reprove the guilty. I would compare, from an Author ap. Suid. : σοφίαν δὲ ἑαυτοῦ κατεψεύδετο, καὶ χαλίνος οὐκ ἦν ἐπὶ τῇ γλώσσῃ.

3. ἰδοὺ, τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλινούς—μετάγομεν. It is now shown by an apt similitude, that oftentimes

little things stir great matters. And ver 3 & 4 seem to be referable to ver. 5. Carpz., however, connects this verse with the preceding thus: "He who has a proper controul over his tongue, can govern his whole body, just as he who holds a horse by the bridle, governs and turns about his whole body." (Rosenm.) And so Hottinger, whom see ap. Pott. Χαλίνους—βάλλομεν. A common phrase in the Classical writers to denote *bridling a horse*. Πρὸς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν, "that they may obey us," i. e. (to use the words of Horace, cited by Rosenm.) "ire viam quam monstfāt eques."

4. καὶ τὰ πλοῖα—βούλῃται, "the barks (for πλοῖον signifies not only a *boat*, but a *ship*, however large)." Τηλικαῦτα, "bulky as they are." I would compare Aristot. Quæst. Mech. 5., μεγέθη πλοίων κίνεται (great bulks of ships) ὑπὸ μικροῦ οἰάκος. Ὑπὸ σκληρῶν ἀνέμων, "by stormy tempestuous winds, which add to the difficulty of guiding them." The epithet σκληρὸς, is often used of winds (and sometimes thunder). To the examples adduced by Wets., I add Procop., p. 67., Dionys. Hal. p. 611., and Nicoph. p. 25. (Corp. Byz.), ὁρμὴ τοῦ εὐθύνοντος, "the will of the steersman." A use of ὁρμὴ found in the later Historians.

4. οὕτω καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστι, καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖ " (as ships are turned about with a comparatively small implement) so also the tongue, though a little member, compared with the rest of the body, may boast of doing great things (good or evil, according to its use, or abuse)." So Œcumen.: μέγала ἐργάζεται, καλὰ δηλαδὴ καὶ κακὰ. And he adds: οὐκ ἐξήπλωται δὲ οὕτως, ὅτι τοῦ συντετμημένου λόγου μαθητῆς ὁ ταῦτα γράφων. In this view I would compare Anacharsis ap. Diog. Laert. 1, 105., ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστὶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθὸν τε καὶ φαῦλον; ἐφῆ, γλῶσσα. The verb μεγαλαυχέω is said by Carpz. to be coined by the Apostle; yet it occurs not only in the Sept., but in the Schol. on Thucyd. 246., nay, in Isocrat., Lucian, Diod., Plut., and other authors, cited by Wets. Ἰδοῦ, ὀλίγον πῦρ ἡλίκεν ὕλην ἀνάπτει. Here ὕλη

signifies a heap of wood or faggots ; as Thucyd. 2, 75. Some take it to denote *forest* ; which is supported by Hom. Il. λ. 155., and Pind. Pyth. 3, 66., cited by Wets. To which I add Thucyd. 2, 77., ἐμβαλόντες δὲ πῦρ (*kindling*) ἤψαν τὴν ὕλην—ἀνῆκε. See also Thucyd. 4, 66., and Eurip. Ion. frag. 6, 2.

6. καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα—ἡμῶν, “And the tongue is, like fire, the cause of numberless evils.” Ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας. On the sense of this phrase there has been much needless discussion. The only probable opinion is, that it is used populariter, (as *world* in our own language), i. e. to denote a *cumulus & congeries malorum*, or, rather, by metonymy, the *cause* of them. On the rest see Slade. Carpz. explains thus : “Etsi lingua est parvum membrum, ignis tamen et ipse est ; totam vitam nostram, et totum terrarum orbem inflammare potest innumerabilibus malis ;” quasi scriberetur τὸν κόσμον τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ἀνάπτει· cui extinguendo non satis est mare, quod totum circumfluit orbem.

6. οὕτως ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν. “It is in our members what fire is, when cast into a wood (for καθιστ. here signifies to *become, be*), i. e. it may be compared to a devastating fire. So Rosenm. Other modes of interpretation may be seen in Benson, Semler, and Pott. Ἡ σπιλοῦσα, “which stains, corrupts the whole body,” as fire destroys the whole wood. Καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τρόχον τῆς γενέσεως. These words involve no little obscurity. Several expositions may be seen in Wets., Kypke, Heisen, and Pott. The most natural and probable one seems to be that of Grot., Heins., Aretas, Mich., Carpz., Rosenm., Pott, and Schleus., namely : “It is that which sets on fire and destroys the whole course of life, from boyhood to old age, and, by raising and nourishing hatred and enmity, renders life a scene of misery. Γενέσεως, *nature* (as 1, 23.), *the world, life*. Thus *the course of nature* is a periphrasis of *life*. See more in Slade. *How* this is brought about it were easy to show ; but the disquisition would be here out of place.

6. καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης. This, like many others in the Apostle, is a dark sentence, the obscurity of which *may*, perhaps, be ascribed to what Carpz. somewhere calls the “vehemens Jacobi et a spiritu Divino immissus affectus.” The most popular opinion is that of Grot., Benson, and Storr, that the φλογιζομένη is put for the Future; and that it refers to the future punishments of hell. The Apostle is thought by most recent Critics to allude to that common notion of the Jews, that punishment was (by the *lex talionis*), literally, to be inflicted on the very member with which any one had offended in this life. So Sapiens. 11, 16. But it can scarcely be supposed that the Apostle would condescend to point an admonition or a warning from so anile a fancy, drawn from the very dregs of Pagan superstition. I am more inclined to think, with some eminent moderns, that the word *hell* is here put for the *Devil*, and the *evil passions* with which he inflames the heart of men, “darts tempered in hell.” See Benson and Mackn. I would compare Euthym. 1127. s. f., τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐξέκαυσιν ὁ διάβολος.

7. πάντα γὰρ φύσις—ἀνθρωπίνη, “Now all animals in nature, whether volatile, reptile, or marine, are tamed, and have been tamed, or subjected by human nature,” i. e. by man. Φύσις θηρίων is said to be for θηρία. But it rather signifies *animals in nature*. Φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη plainly denotes *human kind*, i. e. man, of which expression the Philologists adduce examples. The distribution of the θηρία into the τὰ πετεινὰ, the ἐρπετὰ, and the ἐνάλια, was common. See Gen. 9, 2., and the note of Carpz. So Theocr. Id. 15, 118., πάντ’ αὐτῷ πετεηνὰ καὶ ἐρπετὰ τᾷδε πάρεντι and Æschyl. ch. 5, 78., where see Blomfield. In δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται there is great point and energy. These terms refer to all the various arts by which noxious animals are subdued, or tamed, and the evils from them avoided.

8. τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀνθρώπων δαμάσαι, i. e. “it is more difficult to repress the evils arising

from the abuse of the tongue, than those from the most savage beasts." Such I believe to be the general sense; though it is disputed among Commentators whether the Apostle means one's *own tongue*, or the tongue of *another*. The controversy, however, is frivolous; since both may very well have been had in view. See Benson. Ἀκατάσχετον κακόν, μεστὴ τοῦ θανατηφόρου, "has evils which cannot be effectually checked, but is full of deadly poison." There seems to be an allusion to the bite of a venomous reptile. Carpz. observes, that the origin of the metaphor is in Ps. 139, 14. The term ἀκατασχ. is sometimes (though Wets. fails to notice it) used of *violent disorders* which cannot be stopped (for it does *not*, as Benson supposes, contain a metaphor derived from beasts confined within a hedge). The various ways in which the tongue may produce this mischief may easily be imagined.

9. ἐν αὐτῇ εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Θεόν—γεγόνότας. Here is an amplification of the sentiment at ver. 7 & 8. Ἐν, *in*, *by*, *with*. Εὐλογοῦμεν, *we praise, worship*. Τὸν Θεόν καὶ πατέρα, "God, even our Father," or, "our God and Father." See the note, *supra*, 1, 27. Καταρώμεθα τ. α., "imprecate curses on, heap invectives;" a mixture of cursing and abuse. Spoken per κοῖνωσιν, meaning, Rosenm. thinks, certain teachers. But it rather seems to be meant, *generally*, for all those whom it might concern, who (by the evil example of an age prone to this vice) were probably not a few. The γεγον. καθ' ὁμοίωσιν has reference to Gen. 1, 26 & 27. Carpz. states the argument thus: "It is preposterous to pretend to worship God as our Creator, and return him thanks for the benefits conferred on some of his creatures, and yet others of his creatures, and those made in the image of God, to revile, curse, and heap imprecations on."

10—12. ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος—γίνεσθαι. The dignified gravity of this rebuke is truly admirable. Ἐξέρχεται, *issues*. Οὐ χρή, Hesych. οὐ δεῖ, q. d. "it is

unsuitable to our high calling in Christ that the noblest of God's creatures should so abuse his faculties as not even does the vilest." See Sir. 28, 12—14.

This the Apostle then illustrates by two familiar examples, arguing, as Grot. says, from what is *impossible* in nature, what is *absurd* in morals. *Μήτι ἡ πηγὴ—πικρὸν*. The interrogative involves a strong negation. *Ὁπῆς*, the opening, whence the fountain bubbles up. *Βρίει*, emits. *Ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς*, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) from the same opening, and at the same time. At *γλυκὺ* and *πικρὸν*, must be understood *ὕδωρ*. The *μὴ δύναται—σῶκα*; is the same with the *μητὶ συλλέγουσιν—σῶκα*; at Matt. 7, 16.; and many similar sentiments are adduced from the Classical writers by Wets. and others. The meaning of all such expressions is, that nothing can take place contrary to the laws of nature.

The var. lect. here found in a few MSS., and received by Griesb., is, I conceive, merely an emendation of the early librarii. See Carpz. and Benson. Slade thinks it is an *improvement*; though he suspects the passage to be *altogether* corrupt.

13. Having cautioned them against the abuse of the tongue, the Apostle now goes further, and strikes the very root of that evil, while he warns them against envy and malice in their hearts; assuring them that meekness, peace, and beneficence, proceed from heaven; but envy and contention are the offspring of hell. (Benson.) The best Commentators suppose that the admonition is especially intended for certain conceited teachers, or persons who *would* be such, and who promoted schisms and needless separations of Christian societies.

13. *τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων*. The *σόφος* and *ἐπιστήμων* Pott compares with the *חכם ונבון* in Hos. 14, 10., and Deut. 1, 13 & 15. 4, 6. And he observes, that there is usually this distinction between them, that the former denotes one who knows many things; the latter, one who can teach them to others. See Pollux. Yet they are here nearly synonymous.

Δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας, "Let him show, by a right and virtuous conduct the *works* of wisdom* (as well as utter the *words*), and that of a mild wisdom." Such is (I conceive) the true sense. Ἀναστροφῆς "life and conversation." Ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας is for ἐν σοφίᾳ πραείᾳ. The ἐν is for σὺν. So Rosenm. Πραῦτ. denotes not only *lenity*, but *patience* and long suffering, in opposition to the proud, passionate, and morose dictatorial temper of the teachers in question and other self-appointed censors. Grot. compares the Horatian "mitis sapientia Læli." I add Philostr. V. S. p. 407. fin. τὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἦθος—κεχρωσμενον δὲ οἶον ἡδύσματι, τῇ πραύτητι and p. 528. s. i. τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐρμηνεύειν μαθῶν, ἐπεκρίσμησεν αὐτὸ ὠραῖσμένην πραύτητι.

14. εἰ δὲ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐρίθειαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν. It has been much disputed whether these words should be read interrogatively, or not. Most recent Commentators adopt the *former*, assigning the following sense: "Do ye not falsely boast, arrogating to yourselves contrary to truth, the title of *wise*?" Rosenm. compares a similar pleonasm at Rom. 9, 1. The above method is also approved by Carpz., who read the Epistle twice through, to determine how far this interrogation were consistent with the scope of the Apostle. Yet the common mode of taking the passage, yields a not contemptible sense, and is adopted by Jaspis (whom see), as also by Bp. Hall ap. D'Oyley.

15. οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἀνωθεν κατερχομένη, "This is not the wisdom which was sent by God (in the Gospel), but earthly, animal, carnal, diabolical." The ἐπίγειος Rosenm. explains: non quærens cœlestia, sed terrena, conveniens curvis in terras animis. On ψυχικὴ see the note on 1 Cor. 2. 14. and Jud. 19. Δαιμονιώδης, i. e. such as we may conceive in Satan

* So Clem. Rom. ad. Cor. § 38. (cited by Carpz.) ὁ σοφὸς ἐν-
δεικνύσθω τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.

and the demons, whose wisdom is but cunning and guile, and such as, like theirs, is full of deceit. Carpz. thinks there is chiefly reference to the self erected censors, who only gratified their conceit and malice, seeking neither the honour of God, nor the reformation of men.

16. ὅπου γὰρ—πρᾶγμα. Ακαταστασία, *tumult, dissension*; as Luke 21, 9. and 2 Cor. 6, 5. 12, 20., where see the notes. Φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. This is accounted an hyperbole. But the sense seems to be, that from this source nothing but what is evil can arise.

17. ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία—ἀνυπόκριτος. Under the description of *things* and *qualities* the Apostle couches that of *persons*. Thus the ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία is for οἱ ἄνωθεν σοφοί. Now this wisdom, it is said, is ἀγνή, pure from terrestrial dross. See 1 Joh. 3, 3. Carpz. explains: a sincere and pure heart, removed from all evil affections, which ἀσπιλον τηρεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου. Εἰρηνική, “studious of peace,” in opposition to the strife censured at ver. 15 & 16. Ἐπιεικής, gentle and candid, mild in judging of the lapses of others, and interpreting every thing for the best, sometimes yielding up its right, though it might obtain it by law. Εὐπειθής, tractable, docile, and accommodating. Μεσσή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν. These must be united, as designating ἐλ. in its most extensive sense, i. e. not only of *mercy*, but *beneficence* and *charity*; which is especially signified by the καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν. Compare 2, 14—17. Ἀδιάκριτος, without undue partiality on account of religion, sect, or party. Carpz. explains it: “animis benignus ab iracundiâ et fervore intemperante, personarum etiam delectu alienus,” as opposed to the ζήλος, ἐριθεία, and ἀκαταστασία preceding. Ἀνυπόκριτος, undissembled, candid, free from ambition, &c.

18. καρπὸς δὲ τῆς δικαιοσύνης—εἰρήνην. From the flexibility of the phraseology it is difficult to fix the sense of this verse. Carpz. has minutely discussed it; but his interpretation is too bold and arbitrary.

Rosenm. explains: "fructus autem probitatis saluberrimus ab iis seritur, qui pacem colunt," i. e. "from the study of peace, which they cultivate, many other virtues, as fruits, spring forth:" for as all sorts of vices and evils of every kind arise from envy and strife, so from the study of peace spring all virtues and good of every kind. Δικαιωσύνη here, as often, comprehends the whole range of human duty. Doddr. renders: "The fruit of righteousness in peace is sown for them that make peace;" q. d. They who show a *peaceful* temper (supposing it to proceed from right principles), may assure themselves that they shall *reap* a harvest, in a world where *righteousness* flourishes in eternal *peace*. See also Benson and Slade. With the καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης I would compare Aristid. 1, 388. καρπὸς ἀρετῆς.

CHAP. IV.

From exhortation to the study of peace the Apostle glides into reprehension of the opposite, namely, of broils and disputes, to which too many, especially of the teachers, or those who aimed at being so, were probably addicted. Now these are traced from their fountain, even that of the lusts and passions natural to the human heart. (Pott.)

VER. 1. πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν—ὑμῶν;

In the πόλεμοι and μάχαι some erroneously recognise the elements of those seditions which afterwards broke out into rebellion against the Roman power. The words rather denote domestic strifes, and contentions of sects and parties in the same city. (Rosenm.) These disputes, we may suppose, were fanned by the busy, conceited, and perhaps ambitious and grasping persons before mentioned. See Noesselt and Pott, or Rosenm. Οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν; The ἐντ. must be referred to the words following, with the subaudition of δηλάδη. Ἡδον. is put metonymically to denote *lusts* and *passions*; since these *promise* pleasure to their votaries. Now *such* would vary in different persons (though chiefly, as Carpz. observes, consisting of pride and selfishness); but still there was the lust or pas-

sion warring in their members. The στρατευσόμενων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν, is explained by Rosenm. of *teasing* and *troubling* the mind. And he cites Max. Tyr. Diss. 36. πόλεμον οὐ δημόσιον, ἀλλ' ἰδιωτικόν, οὐ σιδηροφοροῦντα, οὐδὲ πυρφοροῦντα—ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν ὅπλων ἀσίδηρον, ἄπυρον, λυμαινόμενον τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ αὐτὴν πολιορκοῦντα. But this is paring down the sense, which has been well pointed out by Carpz. thus: The seeds and causes of these contentions are αἱ ἡδοναί, a word in the New Testament almost always used in a *bad* sense. Theologians call it *peccatum originis*, the ἁμαρτία καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς, the seed and *fomentum* of all evils. So supra, 1, 14. ἴδια ἐπιθυμία and 1 Pet. 2, 11. ἐπιθυμαὶ σαρκικαὶ αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς (a twin passage), and also Rom. 7, 23. βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντιστρατεύόμενον, &c. By the μελ. is evidently meant the depraved nature of man, ἡ σὰρξ. The στρατ. (which term is here used conformably to the military metaphor) signifies, exert their force, excite, instigate to disturbance." Hottinger well renders: "quæ corporis facibus inflammatis istos in animis vestris tumultus cient." Of πολ. and μαχῇ in the metaphorical sense Wets. adduces numerous examples. The general sentiment is illustrated by Cic. de fin (cited by Rosenm.) Ex cupiditatibus odia, dissidia, discordiæ, seditiones, bella nascuntur. To which I add Mac. Tyr. Diss. 41. p. 428. διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς νόσον οἱ πολλοὶ πόλεμοι & Diss. 20, 6. μεστὰ πάντα ταῦτα πολέμου καὶ ἀδικίας αἱ γὰρ ἐπιθυμαὶ πλανῶνται πανταχοῦ, περὶ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ πλεονεξίας ἐπεγείρουσιν. Propert. 2, 8. Hominum vitiiis ad prælium venit. See also Strabo 780, 35. and Plato de Rep. 600 F.

2, 3. Now follows a more exact description of this contest of the passions and appetites. (Pott.) Ἐπιθυμεῖτε, καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε, "ye desire riches, honours, fame, pleasures," &c. Καὶ but. Οὐκ ἔχετε (for λαμβάνατε), *acquire, obtain them not*. Whitby and Semler refer this solely to the Judaizers stirring up civil commotions. But Rosenm. rightly accounts that too hypothetical; and justly observes, that men of the sort here described are found every where. Φονεύετε καὶ ζήλοῦτε. Many critics, as Erasm. and Beza, thinking φονεύετε too strong a term, conjecture φθονεῖτε. But this would yield too *weak* a sense; and it is unsupported by any MSS.; so that notwithstanding what Benson pleads in its favour, it must be rejected. Neither is it necessary. We have only to take φον. in a similar *mild* sense to that in which we had interpreted the πόλεμοι and μάχαι just before; and *such* a sense is found in various words both of the antient and modern languages.

Thus it may be explained, with Wolf, Mich., Rosenm., &c.: “ye are ready to murder.” I should, however, prefer rendering it: “ye foster a brutal and murderous spirit;” or, taking ζηλ. with it: “ye foster a murderous hatred and jealousy, to come at your ends:” which *partakes* of the guilt of murder. So 1 Joh. 3, 15. “whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.”

2. οὐκ ἔχετε δὲ, διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς.

The sense of these words is obscure, from brevity, and may best be expressed in a paraphrase thus: “Ye attain not the pleasures ye so vehemently long for and seek after [and no wonder, since vice ever cheats its deluded votaries with the *semblance*, but never affords the *reality* of pleasure], because ye do not (seriously) seek them (where alone they can be found, in the practice of true virtue, and in a humble dependence on the Lord of heaven and earth, the giver of every good and perfect gift, casting all your care on Him who careth for you).” Thus alone can disappointment, and the influence of evil passions, be cut off, by subjecting ourselves as humble pensioners on that God who waiteth to be gracious. See Matt. 6, 24.

The next words αἰτεῖτε, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε—δαπανήσητε are said quasi per epanorthosin; q. d. “Ye do, indeed, some of you *ask*, but ye receive not what ye ask, because ye prefer improper petitions (for instance), that ye may have wherewith to expend on your carnal appetites.” See Benson’s references, who adds, that we ought to pray for such things only, and with such *views*, as are good in themselves, and according to the will of God. See Ps. 15, 1. 33, 18. 34, 8. 145, 19—20. Eccl. 2, 6. Joh. 9, 31. 1 Joh. 3, 22. & 5, 14. The phrase δαπασῶν ἐν is (I think) rare. ’Es would have been more correct. So Thucyd. 845. οἱ μὲν τὰ σώματα χεῖρω ἔχωσι, δαπανῶντες ἐς τοιαῦτα ἀφ’ ὧν ἡ ἀσθενεία ζυμβαίνει.

He now admonishes them to abstain from those lusts whence come strifes and dissensions, and, indeed (ver. 4 & 5.), from all *excessive attachment to the things of this world*. (Pott.)

4. μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες. In the interpretation of these words Commentators (as on many other occasions) run into two extremes. Some take them in a strictly literal sense; others altogether in a figurative one, namely, of *spiritual idolatry*, base worldly-mindedness, which would make no sacrifice for religion; and some understand, persons who were neither Christians nor Jews, and who brought disgrace on both. See 2 Pet. 2, 1 & 2. But, assuredly, we

must not fail to *include* the *literal* sense ; since immorality, in the then corrupt state of society, was sure to be found every where, for which, alas, the propensities of our corrupt nature furnish, in all ages, sufficient fuel. By the *ὁ κοσμος* is meant the *corrupt* part of the world, and *sin* generally, the love or preference to which must imply enmity to God, as being at variance with all his plans for the promotion of human virtue, and consequently happiness.

In the words *ὅς αὖ οὖν βουλήθη—καθίσταται* there is a sort of solemn repetition of the position involved in the preceding interrogation. And *καθίσταται* is very significant.

5, 6. *ἡ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει· Πρὸς φθόνον—ἡμῶν ;*

There are few passages in the New Testament that have so much, and with so little success, exercised the Commentators as the present. It is impossible for me to detail and review even half of the various interpretations proposed. First, some would avoid the difficulty by supposing the passage to be corrupt, or a mere *assumption* foisted in from the margin, and therefore to be cancelled. But this is too violent a method to be thought of. As little attention is due to the *conjectures* that have been hazarded. One great difficulty is, that the words to which *ἡ γραφή λέγει* belong, are not found in Scripture (though many Commentators refer to Gen. 6, 3 & 5. and 8, 21. Numb. 11, 29. Prov. 21, 10.), to avoid which, some understand them *interrogatively*, taking the first clause as a general intimation of the infallibility of God ; i. e. “ Do ye think that the Scripture can speak falsely ? or does the spirit which dwelleth in us incline us to vehement envy and rage ? ” See Slade and his references. The best Commentators are agreed that *ἡ γραφή* must refer to some passage of Scripture ; and Semler and Knatchbull fix on some *Apocryphal* book, as Test. Simeonis §. 3., which treats of the baleful effects of envy. But the two passages have nothing common between them but the *subject* ; and to suppose an *Apocryphal* book referred to as a passage of *Scripture*, is not to be thought of. As to the methods proposed by Heins. and Pott, they are justly objected to by Rosenm. Mr. Slade treats the words *πρὸς φθόνον—χάριν* as parenthetical ; and he translates thus : “ Think ye that the Scripture saith falsely (the spirit, that hath taken up his abode in us, resisteth and subdueth the feelings of envy, and gives us a more abundant supply of grace) ? wherefore this Scripture saith, “ God resisteth,” &c. Or thus : “ Does the Spirit, which has taken up his abode in us, lust unto envy ? yea, rather, it gives us more grace.” The latter mode is greatly preferable : indeed, the former (founded on a criticism of Schleusner) can by no means be

admitted, as devoid of authority, and contrary to all analogy. One thing seems clear, that the words in question are the words of *St. James*, and that they must be divided into two clauses, each interrogative. As to the expedient of a *parenthesis*, suggested by Mr. Slade, it seems to be not only too arbitrary, but rather to tend to break up the construction, and yet *more* obscure the sense.

Upon the whole, I see no serious objection to the first mentioned interpretation, which is ably supported by Benson, who paraphrases thus : “ Do you think that the Scripture speaketh in vain, or without a very good reason, *when it condemns such a worldly temper?* No, that you cannot rationally suppose. Do you imagine that the spirit of God, which dwelleth in us Christians, leadeth us to covetousness, pride, or envy? No, *by no means*. On the contrary, unto such as follow his guidance and direction, and excel in love, humility, and moderation, as to the things of this world, he sheweth greater favour. Wherefore, the Scripture saith,” &c. But perhaps no Commentator has so happily and so briefly expressed the sense as the venerable Bp. Hall, ap. D’Oyley and Mant, as follows : “ This the Scripture beateth upon every where ; and do ye think it speaketh thus in vain ? Certainly every word thereof is to excellent purpose, and shall be verified upon us. Doth, then, that Spirit of God, which we profess to have dwelling in us, lust after envy, and envy the good things of others ? Surely not : so far is He from that, as that He giveth more grace where He hath given some already.” The *πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ* seems to be a provincial expression.

The words *μεῖζονα χάριν δίδωσι* are, by Storr, explained : “ God bestoweth more benefits than the world can bestow, if ye be its friends ;” which is, perhaps, a more regular mode of filling up the ellipsis than that of Bp. Hall. *Διὸ λέγει*. The *διὸ* may be rendered, *in which respect, in which view, agreeably to which*. *Λέγει, scil. ἡ γραφή*. The sense, then, is : “ In which view, I repeat, the Scripture saith.” So in Prov. 3, 34. I would compare Æschyl. Pers. 832—6. Blomf. *Ζεὺς τοι κολαστὴς τῶν ὑπερκάπων ἄγαν Φρονημάτων ἔπεστιν, εὐθυνος βαρὺς. Πρὸς ταῦτ’ ἐκείνον, σωφρονεῖν κεχηρμένον, Πινύσκερ’ εὐλόγοισι νουθετήμασι λῆξαι θεοβλαβούνθ’ ὑπερκάπῳ θράσει*. By the *ὑπερφάνοις*, Rosenm. understands those before termed the *friends of this world*, and the *enemies of God*. But it rather seems to denote the envious, self-conceited, censorious, spiritually proud persons above mentioned, in the whole of the preceding Chapter, and to this verse of the present. Now these God *resisteth*, by refusing his grace to prosper their endeavours. The *ταπ.* may denote all those who are, in every respect, obedient to his will.

7. *ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ Θεῷ*, “ Be subject (i. e. subject yourselves) to God ; and seek his favour by perfect obedience, and value it before that of the world.” *Ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ*. The *διαβ.* is interpreted, by many recent Commentators, *the principle of moral evil*, i. e. the friendship of the world. But this is very far-fetched. There seems no reason to abandon

the common interpretation, *the Devil, Satan* (see Benson), which is required by the *φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν* following. Now to resist the Devil is to resist the temptations to sin (especially those before mentioned, namely, pride, self-conceit, sensuality, &c.) which he is permitted to raise in the hearts of men. And the most effectual mode of resisting such temptations is by persevering in the practice of virtue, supported by those aids to human weakness which earnest prayer may draw down from Him who knoweth our weakness, and remembereth that we are but dust. This latter mean is, indeed, suggested by the words following; for *ἐγγίσατε* may mean, draw near in *prayer*, as well as *yield obedience*.

8. *ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐγγίαι ὑμῖν.* An expression, as Benson thinks, derived from the temple worship, in which the Priests drew nigh to the Shechinah. (See his references.) And thus may Christians draw nigh unto God, as a *royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people*, 1 Pet. 2, 9."

8. *καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοὶ.* "By *polluted hands* (says Benson) the antient Heathens meant hands stained with blood or murder. See Herod. 1, 35. and Schol. on Soph. Aj. 667. But the Scriptures do not *confine* the phrase to freedom from murder, but extend it to vice, or wickedness in general. Now both the Heathens and Jews used (and still do) to wash their hands before worship: and to this the Apostle seems to allude." *Ἀμαρτωλοὶ*. This may denote all those guilty of great offences, especially the ones above alluded to, pride, cruelty, sensuality, hypocrisy, worldly-mindedness, &c. By the *δίψυχοι* many Commentators understand those who were wavering between two opinions, i. e. neither Jews, nor Christians, but, by their immorality, a disgrace to both religions. Another view is taken by Carpz., whom see, and also Pott. The expression may, however, denote persons who, though Christians, were wavering and halting between two opinions, the service of God and the service of the world, who,

as we find from ver. 3., did indeed *pray to God*, but prayed with hearts attached to the world, and with tongues which sought alone the world's goods. Now such as these had great occasion to purify their hearts, and rectify such fatal misconceptions of religion.

9. *ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενθήσατε παὶ κλάυσατε, &c.* In this verse there is a prophetic grandeur of style, expressing the same thing in different language. Hence the accumulation, by climax, of terms designating sadness, intended to impress the Christians whom he is addressing with the greater sorrow and shame. Compare 5, 1. (Pott.)

The Apostle means to say that, by having been guilty of such offences as those before mentioned, pride, envy, sensuality, covetousness, &c., it is fitting that they should not *rejoice* in the comforts of the Gospel, but humble themselves by every act that may be expressive of contrition. For, as Rosenm. observes, it is this *animi affectus* that is chiefly had in view. *Weeping and mourning* are to be considered only as acts attendant on contrition, and it is not so much these external acts, as rather the internal feelings that are urged." *Ταλαιπωρήσατε*, "acknowledge and be deeply sensible of your miserable state, even amidst the world's goods, which may so soon fail you." *Ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μεταστραφήτω, καὶ ἡ χάρις εἰς κατήφειαν*, "Let your former levity and sensual mirth be turned into deep penitence and heavy sorrow at having offended God." *Κατήφεια* is a strong term, used by the best authors, from Homer to Plutarch. I would here compare Dionys. Hal. 743, 33. *Γελάτε, ἔφησεν, ἕως ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες Ταραντῖνοι, γελάτε· πολὺν γὰρ τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνον κλαύσετε.*

10. *ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.* The Apostle here suggests some motives for consolation amidst the deep sorrow and repentance to which they are called, namely, that God will, if it be real, heartfelt, and productive of true reformation,

be the means of recommending them to the Divine forgiveness, and raising them to the Divine favour. For I cannot think, with some eminent Commentators, that this has reference to any temporal deliverance and exaltation of the Christians within a few years, by the removal of their persecutors, the Jews.

11, 12. The Apostle here cautions them against censure and detraction, letting them know that it was taking too much upon them, and was, in effect, a censuring the Christian law, which forbade such things; as well as displeasing to Christ, who is our only lawgiver and judge. (Benson.) *Apostolus claudit monitiones de intempestivâ censurâ aliorum, quas inceperat Capite tertio, et huc usque communiverat rationibus: simul revocat nonnulla in memoriam ex superioribus.* (Carpz.)

11. *μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων.* *Καταλαλεῖν* signifies, properly, to *talk against*, and hence to calumniate, censoriously pronounce judgment against, *διαβάλλω*, *κακολογέω*. Such had, perhaps, been the practice of some who, in other respects, were not unobservant of Christian duties. Into the speculations of Commentators on the *persons* intended, and the *particulars* of the calumny, I shall not enter. *Ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ—νόμου.* “He who calumniates or speaks evil of another, and condemns him (i. e. on account of things not forbidden in the Gospel, as the observation of days, meats, &c.), he censures and condemns the law, and the religion itself, of Christ, as being imperfect.” At *νόμου* must be understood *ἡμῶν*, or *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, i. e. *νόμος τέλειος τῆς ἐλευθερίας* 1, 25. (Rosenm., partly from Bens.) It is simplest to suppose the *article* omitted, which will stand for either of these subauditions. Carpzov thinks that by the *νόμος* is meant the *νόμος βασιλικὸς* at 2, 8., which prohibits all calumny. See 1 Pet. 2, 1. and 2 Cor. 12, 20. It is rightly remarked, by Benson and Rosenm., that *κρίνειν νόμον* is, to declare it imperfect, by regarding a certain part of Judaism as necessary to be introduced; and he who thinks he may lawfully

calumniate others, does, in effect, condemn that law as defective, because it has forbidden such calumny." Bp. Middleton would interpret νόμου of *religion*, or *moral obligation* in general, to which candour and good will are essential. A true remark, but such a sense is not permitted by the context. See Carpzov and Slade.

The Apostle then adds yet more. Εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς νόμου, ἀλλὰ κριτὴς, "thou art not a doer of the law, but affectest to be a judge of it, pretending to decide on what is and what is not necessary; a great presumption, which must draw down the heavy wrath of God."

The next words assign a strong reason why this self-erected judgment ought not to be held upon others. Εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπόλεσαι· σὺ τίς εἶ ὃς κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον; q. d. "Thou intrudest into a province that is none of thine. There is one law-giver and judge (and one only), who is (alone) able to save (such as obey him) and to destroy (such as disobey his commands; such being the case), who art thou (weak and erring mortal, thyself accountable to that one judge,) that darest to wrest judgment from his hands, and exercise it on another (especially for not doing what God has not required of him)." By εἰς is meant *Christ*. Δυνάμενος, "who hath the right and power;" as Acts 4, 20. 2 Cor. 13, 8.

13—15. The Apostles now reprove those who presumed too much on the present life, and had not a due regard to their own frailty and mortality, and perpetual dependance on the providence of God.

13. ἄγε νῦν, "come now." A particle (Rosenm. says), of exhortation, to be referred to 5, 1. where it is repeated. It should rather seem to be *here* a form of soliciting attention; as Is. 1, 18. καὶ δεῦτε δὴ, διελέγχθωμεν, λέγει Κύριος. So the Latin age. In the words σήμερον καὶ αὔριον—κερδήσομεν (where some MSS. have the subjunctive, which, however, is less proper,) the Apostle represents the worldly-minded persons in question as saying what, perhaps, was sometimes only the subject of their *thoughts*. The rebuke, however, is well pointed. There is an allusion to the commercial business in which almost all foreign Jews were engaged, and for the furtherance of which they had to take long journeys to distant trading

places, as Tyre, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, &c. *Ἐνιαυτὸν ἔρα*. A certain for an uncertain, but somewhat long, period. See Benson's references. *Ποιήσομεν*, *spend, sojourn*; as Acts 15, 3. 18, 23. 20, 3, where see the notes. So the Latin *facere dies et annos*.

14. *οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τὸ τῆς αὔριον*, i. e. literally, "ye who know not (i. e. though ye know not) the event of the morrow." Here must be understood *πεπραγμένον* or *πρᾶγμα*, i. e. "whether you shall hold your property, or be removed from all enjoyment of it by death, or hopeless sickness." On the uncertainty of the morrow numerous passages are cited by the Philologists, which may very well be dispensed with. See Prov. 27, 1. Then, to illustrate the uncertainty of life, the Apostle subjoins: *ποία γὰρ ἡ ζῶν ὑμῶν*; "For *what*, or how fleeting and frail, is your life! how short a span at the most!" *Ἀτμὶς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινόμενη, ἔπειτα δὲ ἀφανιζόμενη*, "Why it is a vapour, appearing for a short time, and then vanishing away." *Γὰρ, profecto, why*. Similar comparisons of life to a shadow are found in Ps. 102, 12. Job. 8, 4. 1 Chron. 29, 15. And the Classical writers are full of them. The conclusion is, that we ought not to be too anxious to provide necessities for so short a sojourn, but we should cast ourselves on the protection of that God on whom we wholly depend, and endeavour to seek his favour, and obtain his promises.

15. *ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς Ἐὰν—ἐκεῖνο*. These words are closely connected with *σήμερον καὶ αὔριον* (the clause *ποία γὰρ—ἀφανιζόμενη* being parenthetical); and the sense is: "instead of saying (as ye ought), If the Lord please that we live, we will do so and so." Now even the Heathens used expressions of this sort (of which many examples are adduced by Wets.), though we may suppose, rather, as common phrases and words of course; how much then is it the duty of Christians to acknowledge and be deeply sensible of their dependence on God for every thing.*

16. *νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις*, "Whereas *now* (or as things now are, as the custom too much is), ye insolently boast." So Jaspis: "*quæ vestra est arrogantia, gloriamini*." And Schleus.: "*jactabundi gloriamini*." And he compares 2 Macc. 15, 8. Or we may simply render: "now ye rather exult in your boastful projects and plans." Rosenm. explains: "are tickled with the conception of the thing, and, anticipating the pleasure of it, as if it certain, ye break out into boasts." See Carpz.

* Mackn. too much pares down the sense, when he says that the Apostle does not mean that these words should always be used by us, when we speak of our purposes respecting futurity; but that on such occasions, the sentiment which these words express, should always be present to our mind.

17. εἰδότες οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν, καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστίν. This is a conclusion, having reference either (as Beza and Est. think) to all the foregoing reproofs, or (as it should rather seem) only to this Heathenish custom of forming plans without referring their event to God. And so the best Commentators. By the *good* is meant that of acknowledging the providence of God. And ἁμαρτία must be taken *emphatically* to denote *wilful* and *deliberate* sin. The εἰδότες seems to hint at a probable reply from the self-conceited teachers: "We know this very well."

CHAP. V.

VER. 1. ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις. The first six verses of this chapter have been thought by some to be addressed to the unbelieving Jews, among whom the Jewish Christians lived and were persecuted; and of whom many were rich, and for the most part lived a very dissolute life; as we learn from Philo. But, as Benson observes, it is not likely that the Apostle would read his Epistle. He is therefore of opinion that they are here only *apostrophized*: and he gives examples of similar apostrophes from Rom. 18, 20. &c. I, however, assent to Rosenm. and others, that there is no reason why we should not suppose the *Christians* who are censured at c. 2. It is rightly observed by Carpz., that there commences with the words of ver. 1. the apodosis, of which the protasis was extended from c. 4, 3—17.; and that the Apostle means those very boasters, whom he had rebuked, and *repeats* the ἄγε νῦν. He thinks that these, in some measure, nominal Christians, were rich wholesale dealers in merchandize: whence mention is made of their gold, silver, and precious garments.

1. κλαύσατε, "weep" (for well ye may and will). This use of the imperative for the future (in speak-

ing of a thing certain) is characteristic of the prophetic style. Ἐπὶ, *on account of*. The miseries here described are by some thought to have a reference to those which then impended over the Jews, and took place soon after, in the destruction of Jerusalem and the universal dispersion, when those resident in foreign countries received much worse usage than before. See Benson and Mackn. But it is far more natural to interpret the words (with the antients and most moderns) of the miseries and punishments attending an abuse of riches, both in this world, and especially in the next. See Carpz. and Rosenm.

2, 3. ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσηπε, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σή-
τόβρωτα γέγονεν.

It is well observed by Carpz., that in σέσηπε we are not (as many do) to dwell on the etymological sense of *putrefaction* (understanding the πλουτ. of corn, wine, oil, fruit), but solely interpret it de operibus caducis, of riches which come to nought and perish. The perfect is here (as in the words following) used for the present, to denote continuation of action, and *habit*.

3. Ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος κατίωται. By χρυσὸς is meant gold in ingots, or worked up into utensils, or coined; which last use is frequent in the best authors. On κατίωται it is observed by Rosenm., that though gold does not, properly speaking, *rust*, yet by long use it contracts a green colour, and gathers a sort of acrid humour.* I would here compare Philæt. ap. Athen. 380 D. Εἰς αὔριον οὐχὶ φροντίζειν ὅτι ἔσται, περιέρχον ἐστὶν ἀποκεῖσθαι πάννυ ἔωλον ἔνδον ἀργύριον. The Mythological fiction of Tantalus (who was punished with an insatiable desire for what he could not enjoy), inculcates, it may be observed, a fine moral lesson on the punishment of avarice even in *this* world.

In the καὶ ὁ ἰδὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται there is a beautiful metaphor, by which, as Carpz. remarks, sense and speech is ascribed to things inanimate. Ὑμῖν is for ἐφ' ὑμῖν, or ἐπὶ ὑμᾶς, or κατ' ὑμῶν. The sense is: "is a testimony of your covetousness, (since otherwise your money would not have lain by you and rusted)." See Matt. 8, 4. 10, 18. Καὶ φάγεται τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ* ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. A most sublime image (on which see Pott), taken

* I would add, that perhaps the antient gold and silver might be more liable to *rust*, from having a greater proportion of alloy. That gold coin was thought to be subject to rust, appears from Theocrit. Id. 16. where he says that no one would give poets money, nay, not rub off the *rust* of their money and give it them. Χρυσὸς seems properly an adjective signifying *yellow*; as ἄργυρος, *white*. I find an allusion to the latter in Eurip. frag. Œd. 5.

from the deleterious and painful effects of rust, when rubbed into raw flesh. It describes the present misery and future never-ending woe, which must result from the abuse of riches, or the amassing them by lawless methods. At all events I cannot, with Benson and others, refer to the miseries attendant on the destruction of Jerusalem. For the $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho$ plainly alludes to that state where "the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," Mark 9, 44. With respect to the words $\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$, which are abrupt, and have somewhat exercised the Commentators, the best method is to repeat $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho$ from the preceding clause, and render: "For (I say) a fiery punishment (see Hebr. 10, 27.) do ye treasure up against the last days." So Rom. 2, 5. $\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\rho\gamma\eta\nu$. The $\epsilon\sigma\chi.$ $\eta\mu.$ answers to the *day of judgment* in that passage, the period of judgment.

4. $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$, $\delta\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\delta\varsigma\ \tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ — $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$. The Apostle proceeds in a strain of warm indignation against those who, in order to amass riches, had not scrupled to defraud their labourers by various mean and dishonest artifices. By a beautiful figure (found in Gen. 4, 10. 18, 20. Exod. 2, 23 and 24.), and elsewhere, the withheld wages are said to call to God for vengeance. On which Rosenm. remarks: "*Clamare ad Cælum* (i. e. *ad Deum*) quædam scelera et flagitia dicuntur, quia et graviora sunt aliis, et justus judex inter homines iis deesse solet." So Benson: "Those sins are said to cry unto heaven, which so affect the guilty as to seem, with a loud voice, to require vengeance." So we say, "*crying sins*." The Apostle (I would observe) appears to have had in view Malach. 3, 5. $\pi\rho\sigma\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega\ \pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ — $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\delta\omicron\nu\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. In this verse there is a fine parallelism. Carpz. and Rosenm. remark, that $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ are used of all agricultural work, both in fields, and vineyards, up to the time of harvest: and $\theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, of all *harvest work*. But this may be doubted. $\acute{\Lambda}\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ can scarcely signify more than mowing grass, or reaping corn; though $\theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ may denote the *getting in* of any of the fruits of summer. $\epsilon\rho\gamma.$, however, may very well denote *agricultural labourers* of every sort, and at any season. It is needless to refine. On Κυρ. Σαβ. see the note on Rom. 9, 29. and Benson in loc. By

entering into the ears of the Lord (in which there is a fine anthropopathia,) it is implied that they are heard, and will be *attended to*.

I would observe that this *keeping back* of the wages does not necessarily imply *utterly depriving* them thereof, but may, as we say, denote *stopping* wages for various articles of food and clothing supplied to the labourer, and perhaps charged at an extravagant rate; which comes to the same thing. And this is supported by Phocyl. (or rather the Pseud. Phocyl.) in carmine *νουθετικῶ* (ap. Gaisf. Poel. M. p. 447.) ver. 17. *μισθὸν μοχθήσαντι δίδου· μὴ θλίβε πένηται*, which appears to be an imitation of the present passage. The practice seems to have originated in the East, and thence passed into Spain. Thus there is an allusion to it in a well known story of Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, vol. I.

5. *ἐτρυφίσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, &c.* Having censured their rapacity, the Apostle proceeds to animadvert on their *swinish sensuality*. The sense is: "Ye live in all manner of luxury and lasciviousness." On *σπατ.* see the note on 1 Tim. 5, 6. *Ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν ἡμέρῃ σφαγῆς*, "Ye fatten yourselves as for a day of slaughter," i. e. as animals are fattened up for slaughter. So Jerem. 12, 3. "pull them out like sheep for the slaughter, and prepare them for the day of slaughter." *Ἐν* is for *εἰς*. The *καρδίας* is for *ἐαυτοὺς*. Schleus. renders it *stomachs*. But see the note on Acts 14, 17. It may be compared with the Latin *genium*. Here we have a fine image to designate the degrading nature of gross sensuality. Loesner compares Philo 990. where Flacius, despairing of his safety, complains: "*σιτία μοι καὶ ποτὰ καθάπερ τοῖς θρέμμασιν ἐπὶ σφαγὴν δίδονται*." It is well remarked by Carpz., Pott, and Rosenm., that by this figure is also *implied* the *punishment* which will follow their luxury and sensuality. So Carpz.: "*Ut pecorum instar mactemini, obsessi Satanæ porci, extremo judicii die exitio tradendi.*"

I would compare Æschyl. Ag. 1659. where the Chorus thus addresses Ægisthus: Πράσσε, πιαίνον, μιαίνων την δίκην· ἐπεὶ πάρα, &c.

6. κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον· οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν. The Apostle now touches on the merciless *cruelty* with which they endeavour to plunder their inferiors of their little stock, to increase their own overgrown stores. The κατεδικάσατε Rosenm. explains: "Ye bring about, by contrivance and influence, that they shall be condemned by the Judges (Christian or Heathen). And the ἐφονεύσατε: "ye as good as slay them, while by litigation and withholding from them their due, ye deprive them of the means of subsistence." Benson takes it *literally*; and some interpret it of the crucifixion of Christ.

The *cowardice* as well as cruelty of this is noted by the οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν; for little resistance could the poor make in such circumstances! Τὸν δίκαιον is put *collectively*, singular for plural.

7. μακροθυμήσατε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως της παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου. From ver. 7—11. the Apostle turns to the Christians suffering under their oppression, and exhorts them patiently to endure the injuries inflicted on them, seeing that the advent of the Lord Jesus Christ approaches. This he confirms and illustrates by the example of the husbandman waiting for the early and latter rains, and by that held out to them in the suffering Prophets. (Pott.)

The μακροθυμ. has a *double* signification, i. e. patiently endure their persecutions, and patiently wait for the coming of the Lord. This is by many understood of the advent of the Lord to destroy the Jewish nation. But although that may be *included*, I cannot but think (with many eminent Commentators) that it principally refers to the *last* advent of the Lord to the general judgment. (See a Sermon of Bishop Horsely on this text.) For (as Rosenm. observes) of the time thereof the early Christians had learnt nothing certain; but they were continually enjoined

to be mindful of that day which would liberate the good from all the injuries and oppressions of the bad. See ver. 8.

7. ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδέχεται τὸν τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς. The agricultural allusions of James and Jude are by some ascribed to their having been husbandmen. Be that as it may, it has been well observed by Benson, that the works of nature afford the most obvious, noble, and lively comparisons, and such as are most generally understood, and (I would add) especially by an agricultural people like the Jews. Τίμιον, *precious*, as supplying the *staff* of life. The πρώιμον and ὕψιμον denote, Carpz. and Rosenm. remark, what the Hebrews called מלקח or נשם מלקח and נשם מורה, which are used conjointly in Deut. 11, 14. Joel 2, 23. and elsewhere. The πρωῒμ. is that rain which falls at the time when the seed is committed to the ground, namely, the *early autumnal rain*. That by which the corn is brought to maturity is the ὕψ. or *later spring rain*. See Harmer. With the *sentiment* I would compare Aristid. 3, 270 c. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οἱ γεωργοὶ πολλοστῶ μηνὶ τῶν σπερμάτων τὴν ἐπικαρπίαν κομίζονται, καὶ οὐχ ἅμα τῷ καταλείν οὕτω κ. τ. λ.

9. μὴ στενάξετε κατ' ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί, ἵνα μὴ κατακριθῆτε. Benson and Mackn. render: "Do not groan against each other." But though this seems more exact than our common version *grudge*, it is, in fact, *less* so: for στεν. is rightly supposed by the best Commentators to denote that low, and sometimes inaudible, expression of discontent and umbrage signified by our *mutter*, *murmur*, *grumble*. And therefore it is not well rendered by Carpz. *vociferari*. Now this querulous feeling would originate from various passions, mostly above adverted to, *envy*, *pride*, &c. Whether the words can be explained (as they are by some) of the καταλαλία before mentioned, may be doubted. Rosenm. remarks, that the poorer Christians are here forbidden to even groan or murmur under the oppressions of the rich, much less resist them. But this seems a misappre-

hension. The Apostle could scarcely mean to forbid what is but the natural expression of affliction. He seems merely to have in view that *spirit of revenge* which is the result of it. There is, however, no proof that the case of the rich and poor is particularly adverted to. It should rather seem that there is reference generally to all those murmurings for which, from the various competitions of life, and the frailty of human nature, there may, nay must, be frequent occasions, and for which mutual forbearance (as the Poet says :

“ Gentle, compassionate, and kind,
To faults, compassionate, or blind,”)

is the best cure. The most powerful motive, however, to mildness in judgment is that then suggested by the Apostle, ἵνα μὴ κατακριθῆτε ἰδοῦ, κρίτης πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔστηκεν, namely, that we have all to meet a *common judge*, who, with respect to every one of us, may be said to be “ at the door,” since the irreversible judgment in effect takes place at what is to us the advent of our Lord, even the day of our death.

10. ὑποδειγμα λάβετε — Κυρίου. To encourage them to the observance of this precept, the Apostle points to the examples of those who had trod the same thorny path before them. On ὑποδ. see Joh. 13, 15. And on the evils endured by the Prophets see Hebr. 11, 33. seq. Μακροθυμία, “patient endurance of adversity;” as Col. 1, 11. 2 Tim. 3, 10. 4, 2. Hebr. 6, 12. Οἱ ἐλάλησαν τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου, “who spake by the authority and orders of God;” q. d. “If *they* had to encounter such evils, well may *ye* be content to do so.”

11. ἰδοῦ, μακαρίζομεν τοὺς ὑπομένοντας. Ὑπομ. is the participle imperfect; and therefore we need not adopt ὑπομεινάντας from a few MSS. Rosenm. well paraphrases: “We praise the constancy of those who endured such evils, and we pronounce them on that account blessed. Therefore we should imitate their example.” Τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰωβ ἠκούσατε, “Ye have (for instance) heard of, and know the patience of Job.” Notwithstanding the doubts of some scerp-

tical Theologians, it must remain unquestionable that the main events of the interesting story of Job were literally true; though some minor circumstances be worked up in the poetical and oriental manner. On Job see some excellent observations in Suid. 'Ιώβ.

11. καὶ τὸ τέλος Κυρίου εἶδετε. A brief expression for: "ye know the properous end which the Lord mercifully granted to him." Κυρίου is, as Grot. observes, the genitive of *cause*, i. e. ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διδομένον or δοθέν, of which he adduces as examples 2 Cor. 11, 26. 1 Pet. 3, 14. Thucyd. 3, 40. κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑπολειπομένου ἔχθρου. The τέλος κ. is, however, explained by Augustin, Luther, and Wets., the death of Jesus Christ for our salvation, as represented in the Eucharist. But this seems a groundless fancy, which might have been spared, had they remembered the words of Job. 42, 12. (which I am surprised should not have occurred to any of the Commentators) ὁ δὲ Κύριος εὐλόγησε τὰ ἔσχατα 'Ιώβ ἢ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, where the τὰ ἔσχατα answers to the τὸ τέλος of the present passage.

12. πρὸ πάντων δὲ—ὅρκον. Hitherto, Pott. observes, there has been a connection in the several parts; but from this verse (as the Apostle is hastening to a conclusion) there seems to be no regular plan. At ὁμνύετε τὸν οὐρανὸν there is an ellipsis of εἰς or the like. At μήτε ἄλλον τινα ὅρκον, however, the preposition must not be repeated. It is put for, μή ὁμνύετε ὅρκον τινα, μήτε εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, μήτε εἰς τὴν γῆν, μήτε κατ' ἄλλο τὸ χρῆμα. The best Commentators are agreed that the oaths here meant are (as the context requires) those in common conversation, and on trifling occasions, to the use of which the Jews were too prone; and the Jewish Christians, probably, did not sufficiently abstain from it. Thus there was need to remind them of our Lord's prohibition. See Carpz. As to *judicial* oaths, these are by no means forbidden in the Gospel."

12. ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπό κρίσιν πέσῃτε. The reading εἰς ὑπό κρίσιν I suspect to be two readings melted into one.

The recent Editions have ὑπὸ. But εἰς seems to be quite as good. Ἐμπίπτειν εἰς κρίσιν is cited by Rosenm. from Sir. 29, 19. Κρίσιν is for κατακρ., *condemnation*, and consequently *punishment*.

This practice is also disapproved of by Isocr. ad Demon. p. 7. ἔνεκα δὲ χρημάτων μηδένα Θεῶν ὁμόσεως, μηδὲ ἂν εὐορκεῖν μέλλης, δόσεις γὰρ τοῖς ἐπιорκεῖν, τοῖς δὲ φιλοχρημάτως ἔχειν.

13. From hence to ver. 18. follows a general admonition to preserve patience and fortitude under adversity, and especially when suffering under sickness. (Pott.) And in order to the attainment of this, the Apostle very properly suggests the use of prayer to God, who (to use the words of the Royal Psalmist) “holdeth our soul in life, and suffereth not our feet to slip. Κακοπαθεῖν signifies to be in trouble, calamity, or affliction. It is remarked by Rosenm.: “Judæi quædam morborum atrociorum genera tribuerunt dæmoniis, illisque ejiciendis adsciverunt varias formulas verborum et cærimonias tristes. Talem morborum curationem prohibere videtur Jacobus.” But this is too hypothetical and precarious. I would simply understand this passage as enjoining the use of prayer, as the best unction and balm for the wounds of affliction, in opposition to those resources which the world suggests, as the giving vent to passionate exclamations, the use of strong liquors, taking refuge in noisy merriment, &c. See Benson and Mackn.

On the sense of ψάλλω see the note on 2 Cor. 1, 17. and Col. 3, 16.

14. ἀσθενεῖ τις—Κυρίου.

The τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους Carpz. explains, viros peritos, pios, cordatos, viros proveci jam ætate, in quibus major rerum usus et consilia solidiora sunt quàm plerumque in junioribus. And he adds: “Olim consilia dabant ii ætate conspicui erant, et propter gravitatem *Patres*, propter ætatem *Presbyteri* vocabantur.” To this, however, it is objected by Noesselt and Rosenm., that the name πρεσβ. τῆς ἐκκλησίας, in the New Testament, always denotes the *presidents of the church*. Ἀσθενεῖ must, from the context, denote *sickness*. The Apostle directs that these Presbyters be called in, and pray over the sick, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. Now Noes. and Rosenm., and many others, would join ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ

Κυρίου with προσευξ., i. e. "pray in the name of Christ." But this seems harsh. It is better to refer the words both to the προσευξ. and the ἐλαίῳ; since the whole was done in dependence on the aid of God, thus solemnly invoked; though, as far as regarded the oil, it might be called a *medical* as well as religious means. For, as Carpz. observes, the generous oil of the East has powerful medicinal properties, and is used for various disorders; and he refers to the story of the good Samaritan and Mark 6, 13. He and Ros. would take the oil as put for *any* medicaments the case might require. But this seems too harsh; and would be supposing the Presbyters skilful physicians; unless indeed they administered them under the direction of such. The difficulty *might* be removed by supposing, with some eminent Commentators, as Deyling, Wolf, Benson, that *miraculous* healing is here meant, with which the use of oil would not be inconsistent. Thus the disciples, Mark 6, 13., used it even *with* the miraculous power. And even our Lord himself condescended in general to employ some *media* of producing his miraculous effects. But this hypothesis is liable to some objections, which I cannot detail, and seems scarcely tenable: though I would by no means deny that miraculous cures did sometimes then arise from the prayer of faith. It is remarked by Rosenm.: "Fuit nempe hæc commotio animi sanctior, non semper quidem, sæpe tamen, conjuncta cum restitutione valetudinis, præcipuè, si languor corporis ex animi mœrore et tristitiâ ortus et auctus esset." Which I can scarcely understand. It should seem to have been a religious ceremony accompanied with the use of oil, as a *symbol of cure*; though it might sometimes *contribute* to it. How far and in what proportion that means, or the strongly affected mind of the patient or the real efficacy of the prayer of faith, produced these effects, would, of course, be different in different circumstances; and therefore nothing can well be defined. But one thing seems certain, namely, that (to use the words of Dodd.) this is far removed from the *extreme unction* practised by the Romanists, not for cure, but when life is despaired of. See especially Benson. The term εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως, does not *necessarily* imply any extraordinary or miraculous effect. And though it is said σώσει τὸν κάρνοντα, yet I agree with Rosenm., that it does not follow that *all* the sick persons thus prayed over recovered: the σώσει (and he might have added ἐγερει and ἀφεθήσεται) is to be taken with *restriction*, i. e. "this prayer will help the sick, if it be the will of God, and expedient to his salvation. That is (it is meant) the use of this religious ceremony shall *tend* to produce the good effects implored, so far as may be consistent with the plans of God, and his knowledge of the true state of the patient's heart.

16. ἐξομολογῆσθε ἀλλήλοις τὰ παραπτώματα. This is understood by most Commentators of confession of some great sin which may have caused the disorder, and by which confession the recovery would be furthered. But it may also be understood ge-

nerally of a confession of injuries done to any person or persons, accompanied with entreaty for pardon, and which ought to draw from the injurer not only forgiveness, but prayer. Thus (I find) Carpz. takes this verse to commence a new exhortation, not connected with the former. Yet it is harsh to take *ὁπως* *ιαθῇτε* (as he does) of the healing and amending of *sinful habits*; for the context requires it to be taken in a *physical* sense. It may denote that by the use of all the above means the healing of the sick will be *promoted*; i.e. they will *tend* to produce it. The prayers here meant, Rosenm. thinks, are *public*. See more in Benson and Mackn., or Slade.

16. πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις—ἐνεργουμένη. Rosen. renders: "Precatio pii multum valet efficere;" taking it for ἰσχύει ἐνεργεῖν. But this is sinking the ἐνεργουμένη, in which the difficulty is seated. Of all the versions the E. V. *effectual*, is the worst, as being miserably tautological. Possibly it may be rightly rendered by Hamm., Bull, Benson, Wells, and Mackn., "prayer inwrought by the spirit;" for this verb and its cognate ones are often used of inspired prayer. See Schl. Lex. or Wahl. I could compare Procop. B. G. 2. p. 64, 29. ἀνὴρ δίκαιός τε καὶ Θεῷ μάλιστα φίλος, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐνεργοῦσαν ἐς ὃ, τι βούλοιο αἰεὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἔχων. But it is not clear that the context will permit this: and it may very well be rendered, with the Vulg., *assidua, earnest, ardent*; for the participle *passive* often signifies what is done with much labour, ἐνεργές. On the availing of the prayer of the righteous see the numerous references in Benson.

17, 18. On ὁμοιοπαθής, "a mere mortal, of like faculties with ourselves, with no more natural powers than such as we possess," see the note on Acts 14. 15. Προσευχῇ προσήύξατο, "prayed earnestly." At τοῦ μὴ must be understood ἕνεκα. Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is taken by most recent Commentators to mean the ten tribes of Israel. And to this sense Benson thinks the connexion determines it. On the trifling discrepancy in the three years and six months of James,

and what we find in Luke 4, 25., see the note on that passage. *Κάρπον* is used collectively for *fruits*. *Βλαστ.* is used of the growth of corn or grass, or any other of the fruits of the earth.

It is observed by Rosenm., that St. James adduces the example of Elijah, to show that God listens to the prayers of good men; but does not define whether he satisfies their wishes in a natural or in a miraculous manner. See, however, Benson.

19, 20. The Apostle now, in some measure, returns to the subject of ver. 15 & 16., in which, having exhorted them to mutual confession, he now inculcates mutual assistance in correcting each other's vices. (Pott.)

Πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας must denote not only a deviation from truth and purity of doctrine, but also from *true virtue*. So Joh. 3, 21. *ὁ ποιῶν ἀληθείαν*. Compare 1 Joh. 3, 8. Rom. 2, 8. and other places. Thus *ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ*, will denote not only error of opinion, but of practice. See Benson. *Σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου*, i. e. by leading him to reformation, he will do what shall tend to the salvation of his house.

20. *καὶ καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν*. It has been a disputed point whether this *covering* of sins should be referred to the person who converts, or to him that is converted. The *former* opinion is adopted by Bede, Aquin., Origen, Damasc., Vorst., Hamm., Whitby, Wells, Pyle, and others; and it is countenanced by a few parallel passages of the Old Testament, as Prov. 16, 6. and Dan. 14, 27.; and is ably defended by Hamm. and Whitby. The *latter* opinion is supported by the most eminent Commentators from Grot., as Benson, Pott, and Rosenm. They argue (to use the words of Slade) that "it seems hardly consonant with the language and doctrines of the Gospel, that any sin should be forgiven, if it be unrepented or persisted in; and if it be repented and forsaken, it will be pardoned *without* the meritorious act here mentioned." This might perhaps admit of a satisfactory answer; but when the context is

attentively considered, I cannot but wonder that any should ever have interpreted the words otherwise than in the latter way. To the objection, that "thus the latter clause will add nothing to the sense," it may be replied, with Mr. Slade, that the Apostle is treating of the sick, &c. And he might have added that innumerable instances of a similar *exergasia* are to be found in Scripture. The passage is very well paraphrased by Mr. Slade (after the above Commentators) thus: "Brethren, if any of you shall have erred from the truth, and one shall have converted him, know, that he who (in such circumstances, i. e. of sickness or disease) shall have turned a sinner from the error of his way (shall have led him effectually to repent of his offences, and have thus prepared him for the prayer and blessing of the elders), will be the means of saving him from death, and of *drawing a veil over* many of his transgressions (of screening them from the sight or remembrance of God, as well as men, i. e. of obtaining for them pardon and entire forgiveness)." See also Bp. Hall ap. D'Oyly. Now in this clause, as in the former one, it is the *tendency* only that is spoken of, i. e. "he shall do what will *tend* to save his soul from perdition, and will *contribute* to his former sins being covered, hidden out of sight, and forgiven by God. See Ps. 32, 1. In no other way can it be understood; since even conversion, when real, does not necessarily imply *final perseverance*, which can alone ensure salvation.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

FOR introductory matter to this Epistle I must refer the reader to the usual authorities. I will only observe, in reference to the doubt entertained whether St. Peter's remains are really deposited at Rome, that the fact is attested by Procop. 195, 10.

CHAP. I.

VER. 1. In this and the following verse there is contained a salutation; but the exordium of the whole Epistle extends to ver. 12. (Carpz.)

1. ἐκλεκτοῖς, *Christians* (as Rom. 8, 33. and else where). A title taken from the Old Testament, in which the Israelites are called בְּחֹרִים. Παρεπιδήμοις, תְּרַשְׁבִּים, Jews dwelling out of the country, and therefore sojourners. Some understand *proselytes of the gate*, not circumcised, but worshipping the one true God. This interpretation they found on C. 4, 3., which seems to hint that those to whom Peter wrote were not all Jews by nation. But see the note in loco. (Rosenm.) The same view too, is taken by Carpz., who observes that there were in the congregation doubtless many converted Gentiles as well as Jews. So in St. Paul's Epistles to Gentiles we often meet with expressions which relate to *Jews*. And Wolf, Rosenm., and Pott have shown that the Epistle was written to all Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, in the countries out of Palestine; though chiefly to the Jews. For many things occur in the Epistle which pertain to the Jews only; and others only to the Jews.

1. διασπορᾶς Πόντου, “dispersed over Pontus.” The Jews were indeed dispersed over various regions, at different times and occasions, whether in wars, as by Tiglath Phalesar, Shalmanazar, and Nebuchadnezzar, or to avoid internal evils, on which accounts many emigrated into Syria, Egypt, and other parts of the Roman empire. See a curious passage in Plato 1031 D. where are named Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, all countries of Asia Minor. When, therefore, *Asia* is separately mentioned, we are to understand Asia Proper, i. e. Proconsular, viz. Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, Lydia, and the sea-coast generally of Asia Minor. The ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, &c., are, then, the Jewish Christians dispersed over those countries. (Rosenm.) That ἐκλεκτ. cannot imply absolute election to life eternal, See Lardner ap. Slade.

2. κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ πατρὸς—Χριστοῦ. The κατὰ πρόγνωσιν is to be referred, per trajectionem, to the ἐκλεκτοῖς preceding. Πρόγνωσις here signifies *counsel, desire*; as Acts 2, 23. The sense then is, that they were brought to the Christian religion by the counsel and desire of God the Father. See Eph. 1, 5 & 11. Ἀγιασμῶ, *consecration, initiation*. Now those are initiated into religion (εἰς ὑπακοήν), who are *instructed* in it, which instruction was effected by the *spirit* (πνεῦμα), not immediately, but through the Apostles and other inspired teachers. Ὑπακοή does not belong to αἵματος, but stands alone. Παντισμὸν is joined with it, and must be taken passively. By ὑπακοή is meant the *embracing* of the religion, ὑπακοή πίστεως; so termed, because a belief in the doctrines and an obedience to the injunctions of Christ is involved in embracing his religion. Παντισμὸν is derived from the ceremonial law. See Exod. 24, 8. and Numb. 31, 23. So *we*, in entering the heavenly sanctuary, must be sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and purged from our sins; which is effected by that blood. The death of Christ is therefore the cause of the remission of our sins, and a reason why

we should avoid sin, and live holily, righteously, and godly.

2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη. There is the same prayer in 1 Cor. 1, 3. and elsewhere.

3. Incipit Petrus ab insigni religionis Christianæ commendatione, et commemoratione beneficiorum Dei, in illos Judæos collatorum, v. 3—12. (Rosenm.) The Apostle reminds them of the happy immortality set before them in the Gospel, and which they would *obtain*, if they continued true to their Christian profession. This paves the way for the mention of *trials* and *persecutions* introduced at ver. 6. Ἀναγεννᾶν is here, by most recent Commentators, interpreted *recreate, feliciorem reddere*; and this is countenanced by ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν just after. But it seems only a *secondary* sense; and the primary one is, doubtless, the *regeneration* we experience on becoming Christians. So, in a kindred passage of Tit. 3. 5. κατὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλεον ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς, διὰλουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως. Πνεύματος ἁγίου. This regeneration, of course, implies a change for the better, both physical and moral.

The ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, Carpz. explains, *spem certam, ἀσφαλῆ*. But this is too limited. It must mean a vigorous, active, spirit-stirring hope; as opposed to the cold faint hope of Heathenism, nay, even Judaism. There may, too, be an allusion to the "*life*" which Christ *emphatically* "*brought to light*." Rosenm. and Pott render: *lætissimam*. But this is too vague. Now this hope was ministered by Christ's resurrection, inasmuch as that showed the possibility of our own resurrection, and as being a *proof* and *pledge* thereof, and a seal and confirmation of the whole Christian doctrine.

4. εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον. The Apostle explains the *object* of that hope, even the greatest felicity that can be enjoyed. (Bens. and Rosenm.) Κληρονομία is often used to denote *certainty* of attainment. Ἀφθαρτον, *imperishable*, "like the joys of paradise (says Rosenm.),

ever flourishing." Benson thinks there is an allusion to the *immortality* of the former verse. Ἀμίαντον, *undefiled, pure*, uncontaminated by those frailties and vices which so detract from all human happiness, and untainted with that evil which in this world is necessarily mixed with good. Such appears to be the simplest sense; though Benson has many refined speculations, and Pott runs into the other extreme of treating the ἀφθ., ἀμιαντ., and ἀμαρ. as mere synonymes, accumulated to represent consummate felicity. Ἀμάραντον, *never fading*, because (as Mackn. explains) it will never grow old; its beauties will remain fresh through all eternity; and its pleasures never become insipid by enjoyment. Τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανόις εἰς ἡμᾶς. So ἀποκεῖσθαι, 2 Tim. 14, 8. and Col. 1, 4. where see the note. "Not (explains Bens.) to be enjoyed in Canaan, or on this earth, or under the kingdom of a temporal Messiah, but *secure in heaven*; which denotes its certainty, duration, and excellence." See 2 Pet. 3. 13.

5. τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους—ἐσχάτῳ, "For ye who are preserved and guarded by the powerful protection of God (who can give us all the felicity we *hope* for), through faith, i. e. through the profession of the Gospel, by which ye obtain it," or (as some explain) under condition of faith in the Gospel. Now this, the Apostle says, is ἐτοιμὴ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, i. e. is reserved, destined to be revealed, and will be revealed and imparted to us. Ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ. This some understand of the destruction of Jerusalem, or the *Gospel age*, the last end of the world. But it seems most natural to interpret it of the final consummation of all things. For, as Benson says, the revelation of Jesus Christ is sometimes called the end of the world, the last day, the last time. And at the general conflagration a great salvation shall be revealed." See his note.

6. ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιάσθε—πειρασμοῖς. By this very hope of future felicity, and the beneficial effects of adversity in producing moral reformation, the Apostle

supported them under the tribulations to be endured in the cause of religion. Ἐν ᾧ, by the perpetual custom of the Apostle of joining periods to periods by the use of the pronoun relative, is for ἐν τούτῳ δὲ, scil. καίρῳ ἐσχάτῳ; or we may, with Grot. and Wolf, subaud. χρήματι. (Pott) Ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is for the future, ἀγαλλιᾶσεσθε. Εἰ δέον ἐστι, “if thus it must be (see Acts 14, 22.);” namely, from the nature of circumstances, and the disposition of the Jews and Heathens. The sense is: “this felicity ye expect, although *now*, for a *time* ye feel misery from various tribulations brought upon you by the Jews and unbelieving Gentiles.” Ὀλίγον, short, as compared with eternity. (Rosenm.) Other modes of interpretation are propounded by some Commentators. See Pole, Pott, and Benson. The ὀλίγον may perhaps signify both a *short time*, and “*in a slight degree*.” The εἰ δέον ἐστι *may* be rendered, “seeing it is needful.” And so Benson and Jaspis. But it rather seems that the expression is highly elliptical, and is used because some of those whom the Apostle addressed were thus afflicted, and others not. Now εἰ δέον ἐστι would, in its popular acceptance, embrace both. I would here compare Philostr. V. Ap. 4, 37.

7. ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως—Χριστοῦ. The τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμ. τ. π. signifies, “that by which your faith is tried,” or, “your approved faith,” i. e. reliance on God for a happy termination to your trials, and firm constancy by which you bear up under them. See more in Benson and Pott. Δοκίμιον is, as Rosenm. says, put for δοκιμή (as at James 1, 3.), i. e. πίστις δοκιμαζομένη. Now this, it is said, is more precious than the most precious of metals, and is far more permanent than that which resisteth corruption the longest, even gold.

By the ἀποκαλύψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, must be meant the advent of Christ to judgment. Now as gold is said διὰ πυρὸς δοκιμάζεσθαι, so, it is meant, that our

virtue, the most valuable of all our possessions, is tried and proved.

8. ὃν οὐκ εἰδότες ἀγαπᾶτε—δεδοξασμένη, “Whom, though not having seen (when on earth), ye love, and in whom, though not now beholding, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and glorious.” The *loving* and *trusting in*, denote the recognising him as Messiah, and from him alone looking for salvation. The εἰδότες is supposed by Wells to allude to the case of Thomas, and to the words which our Saviour uttered on that occasion; “Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed,” Joh. 20, 29. At ἀγαλλιᾶσθε subaud εἰς ὃ, which is for ἐφ’ ὃ. Δεδοξασμένη, *exalted. supreme.* So 2 Cor. 3, 10. οὐδὲ δεδοξάσται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει. Besides (as Pott remarks) the blessedness of the Messiah’s kingdom is usually represented under the term δόξα. See Schleus. Lex. The ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is explained by Benson and the recent Commentators as put for the future. And so some of the antient Versions. But this is precarious, and indeed unnecessary; since the joy in question would have its *commencement* in *this* world; though its *consummation* would be reserved for another.

9. κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. Agreeably to the interpretation of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε just mentioned, the κομιζόμενοι is by some taken for κομισάμενοι. But this is too bold. It is only necessary to suppose the word to refer to their being placed in a state which led to salvation, and that so certain that, unless it were their own fault, they might be said already to have it. Κομιζ. here signifies to carry off as a reward; as 2 Cor. 5, 10. and Eph. 6, 8. where see the notes. Τὸ τέλος, the best Commentators are agreed (like the Hebr. תַּיִתָּה), is, by an agonistical metaphor, used to denote the *crown*, or *reward*. See Rom. 6, 21. Σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. So James 1, 21. σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. I agree with Moldenhauer and Rosenm. that this has reference to the present blessings as well as the future felicity, conferred by the Gospel.

10. *περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας—προφητεύσαντες*, “concerning which felicity, and its nature, the Prophets studiously examined, and diligently enquired after (the Prophets I say), who prophesied of the grace which was to come unto you.” The *ἐξ.* is intensive. They saw (says Rosenm.) that something great was reserved for our later times; but *what* it would be, the Prophets did not fully apprehend. (Compare Luke 10, 24.) They prophesied, indeed, of the blessings of which we are now made partakers; but, for the most part, under types and shadows.” The various blessings of the Gospel are here, as often, designated by the general term *χάρις*: and (as Rosenm. observes) their being *prophesied* is mentioned, as showing that they are not fortuitous.

11. *ἐρευνῶντες εἰς τίνα—δόξας*. *Ἐρευν.* is for *ἐρευνήσαντες*, and that for the verb. The sense, then, is: “For they diligently investigated at what time, and what *kind* of time, that would happen which the Holy Spirit, given by Christ, had showed to them, who, by his inspiration, signified what Christ should suffer, and the glory to which he should be exalted.” *Τίνα ἢ ποῖον* are treated by Pott as synonymous; as in Mark 4, 30. and Acts 7, 49. He also adduces some passages of the Classical writers. But in those cases there are *parallelisms*, which is not the case *here*. Rosenm. rightly thinks the *ποῖον* may refer to the state of the people, whether wholly free, or partly so, or in bondage. The Apostle is supposed to have in view Dan. 9, 22 & 23. At *τὰ* there is the usual ellipsis of *ὧν*. The Spirit is called the Spirit of *Christ*, because it was then given by Christ to the Prophets (especially as concerning himself). *Τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα*, sub. *ἐσόμενα*, which is for *ἀποβησόμενα* (like the *τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Acts 5, 1.). There is the same ellipsis at *τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας*. The *δόξας* refers to the various glories subsequent to the passion of Christ, namely, his resurrection, ascension, glorification, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the

calling of the Gentiles, the working of miracles, &c. Phil. 2, 9.

12. οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς· ἡμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτὰ, “To whom (in consequence of their anxious enquiry) it was revealed, that not for their own benefit, or with relation to themselves, but for us, and to us, they were made ministers of announcing those things unto us (those things, I say) which now have been (plainly) revealed to you by those who have preached the Gospel to you, by the influence and assistance of the Holy Spirit sent from heaven (things, I say), over which the angels bend with admiration, and delight to look into.” Of διακονεῖν in the sense *announce*, Rosenm. adduces an example from Joseph. Ant. 6, 13. ταῦτα δὲ τῶν πεμφθέντων διακονησάντων πρὸς τὸν Νάβαλον. Εὐαγγελεῖν, in an active sense, with the Accusative of person for a Dative, is frequent in Scripture. It is observed, by Rosenm., that the predictions of the Prophets preceded, in order to increase our faith in the preaching of the Apostles. Εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν παρακύψαι. Παρακ. is taken as at James 1, 25., where see the note. By the ἃ are meant all the wonderful things above mentioned, before their event not thoroughly known to the *Angels*, but now surveyed and contemplated with wonder and delight; for that is the sense of ἐπιθυμ. Perhaps nothing can more strongly excite our admiration of the Gospel than this glorious passage.

13. Now follows an exhortation to a holy life, deduced from the foregoing commemoration of the glories and blessings of the Gospel: and this is extended to 3, 16. (Rosenm.)

13. διὰ ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφύας—Χριστοῦ, “Wherefore, such being the glory and felicity prepared to reward your obedience, gird up the loins of your minds.” A metaphor, as Rosenm. says, in which there is blended the *image* of the thing, and the *thing expressed by the image*. It is (he thinks) a metaphor

taken from *Oriental* travellers, who, on setting out, gird up their long flowing garments about their loins. But it may have reference to *any* active exertion or labour, to which such girding is there equally necessary. The application is obvious. On *νύφειν* see 1 Thess. 5, 6. and 2 Tim. 4, 5. and the notes. *Τελείως* must be construed with *ἐλπίσατε*. It is, as Fischer thinks, for *τελέως*, and stands in the place of *εἰς τέλος*, *constantly*. In the words following Rosenm. thinks there is a *trajectio* for *ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The *χάρις* (he observes) denotes the highest effect of Divine benevolence, namely, eternal felicity. *Φέρειν* here signifies to *offer*: for that is offered unto all who obey the Gospel; but will be *attained* only at the revelation of Jesus Christ, when he will show his majesty to all, both men, angels, and demons.

14. *ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς*, for *τέκνα ὑπηκούα*. The *συχηματίζεσθαι* is strangely rendered, by Rosenm., *transformari*. It rather means *conformari*, or, as being reflected verb, *se conformare*, to conform, accommodate, mould oneself by (σὺν) any mould. *What* these *ἐπιθυμίαι* were, we find from 4, 3. *Ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ* is for *ἐν χρόνῳ τῆς ἀγνοίας* (as at Acts 17, 30.). before they had been enlightened by the Gospel.

15, 16. *ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε*, “But, after the example of the holy Being that hath called you, be ye also, in all your conduct and behaviour, holy.” Thus we are to imitate our Father and our God, as good children do their parents. The sentiment is confirmed from Levit. 11, 44. It is well remarked, by Rosenm., that such an imitation must be still more incumbent on *us*, who profess a far purer religion than Judaism.

On *ἀναστροφῇ* in the above sense I have before treated. *Ἅγιος*, it may be observed, is an epithet which is, above all others, applicable to God, and ascribed to him in Scripture. See Pole’s Synopsis.

17. Now follows the *second* argument, by which

we are actuated to virtue, and that derived from the Divine benignity and justice. The *καὶ* is rendered, by Rosenm., *immo*. But it may more simply be rendered *porro*, and *further, moreover*. Εἰ, ἴδ, *seeing that*. Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἁ. κ. κ. τ. ἐ. ἐ., “ye religiously invoke (or profess so to do) a Father who impartially judgeth every one’s work.” Ἀπροσωπολήπτως, “without reference to birth or fortune, or any thing but virtue.” Ἔργον is a collective put for the plural. Ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε. Ἀναστρέφεισθαι signifies *versari, se gerere*; as 2 Cor. 1, 12. Eph. 2, 3. and 2 Pet. 2, 18., and often in the later Classical writers. Τὸν χρόνον is an accusative of *duration of time*. Παροικίας, *sojourn*; and that in two respects, both as sojourning among the Gentiles, and as human life is itself a sojourn. See Heb. 11, 13., and consult Slade. I would compare Arrian Ep. 2, 23. and Philostr. V. ap. 1, 22. s. m. χρόνος τῆς ἀποδημίας. By ἐν φόβῳ is denoted anxious caution in our conduct, through fear of offending God; as in Phil. 2, 12. μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργ., where see the note.

18, 19. εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς—πατροπαράδοτου, “Knowing (as ye do), and bearing in mind, that ye were not, by corruptible things (however precious), as gold and silver, liberated from your vain and foolish conduct and manner of life received from your forefathers.” Ματαίας, *vain, vicious*; as Tit. 3, 9. It has reference not only to *idolatry*, but to the other vices which that carries with it, and to which human nature is so prone. Ἐλυτρώθητε may simply signify *liberated*: but there is an allusion to the atoning blood of Christ, without which not even the religion that liberated them could have been promulgated. Τιμίῳ αἵματι, “with that blood which procured us the most precious advantages.” The ἀμώμου and ἀσπίλου have an allusion to the requisites in the victims, which were to be without blemish or defect, i. e. by either being defective, or crippled in any member. Of the blemishes mention is made in

Levit. 22, 20—24. and Mal. 1, 8. Now the spotlessness of Christ consisted in his being absolutely exempt from all sin. The *ὡς* is taken, by Rosenm., for *ἀληθῶς*. But this is too arbitrary. The sense is: “as (being).” So Pott resolves it by *ἦν γὰρ αἷμα ἁμνου*, &c. He observes that *lamb* and *dove* have ever been symbols of innocence and patience. Compare 1 Cor. 6, 20. & Rom. 4, 7—9. And see Slade.

20, 21. *προεγνωσμένου μὲν*, &c., “Of that Christ (I say) who was ordained, destined to this work of liberation and redemption before the creation of the world, but made his appearance in these latter times for your sakes, who, by him and his preaching, trust in God that raised him from the dead and glorified him, so that your faith and hope are (reposed) in God.” Such, I conceive, is the true sense. *Προγινώσκειν* here signifies, not to *foreknow*, but, what is consequent on it, *predetermine*, *predestinate*, *decree*. Thus it is joined with *προορίζειν* at Rom. 8, 29., and Kypke adduces some Classical examples, but not apposite. *Πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, “from eternity.” This has been before explained. *Φανερ.* has the *reflected* sense, *having showed himself*, *appeared*; which may include his *actions* on earth. See Rosenm. On *ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων* see Heb. 1, 1. *Δι’ ὑμᾶς* (on which Pott unnecessarily dilates) plainly signifies, you and your fellow Christians, or you Christians. *Δι’ αὐτοῦ*, “by him,” i. e. by his doctrine, miracles, and the various blessings he imparted. See Joh. 14, 6. and Heb. 7, 25. By *πίστις* is meant not only *belief* in God (for in *that* they were not wanting), but trust in his mercy, as shown in sending the Messiah to redeem and bless. This includes (what the words following hint at) their belief in the Divine legation of *Jesus*. Or, as Benson explains, they believed not so much in God who had brought them out of the land of Egypt, who had raised and glorified *Jesus Christ*.

21. *ὥστε τῇν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς Θεόν*. Rosenm. (from Bens.) paraphrases: “In vain do

your countrymen charge you with defection from God; for your very faith and hope in Christ tend to that God of whom they *profess* to be worshippers." In this and the preceding verse, Benson thinks the Gentile converts are meant. But that seems an erroneous opinion.

22. After having given the above arguments to the living holily and righteously, he returns to the *exhortation* that they should strive after virtue, and, above all, *brotherly love*. (Pott.)

22. τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγωνίζεσθε, &c., "Wherefore, having purified your hearts by your obedience to the true doctrine, so far as to bear a sincere love to your Christian brethren, see that ye (continue to) love each other with a pure heart, and ardently." In ἡγωνίζεσθε Rosenm. recognizes a similitude derived from the lustrations previous to sacrifice enjoined by the Mosaic Law, Exod. 19, 10. What the Christian lustrations previous to worship should be, few can need being informed. See Rosenm. By the ἀληθεία is meant "the truth as it is in Jesus, the Gospel." Τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας, "hearkening to the Gospel of truth, embracing the religion to whose acceptance it invites. The διὰ πνεύματος, Benson explains, "made and confirmed by the Spirit." But it seems to refer to the influence of the Holy Spirit, both in the promulgation of the Gospel, and in its operation on the hearts of believers unto sanctification. So ver. 2. ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος. These words are, indeed, omitted in some MSS.; but that is only ex emendatione, since they seem to interrupt the construction. Ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας is taken as at 1 Tim. 1, 5., where see the note. I would compare Æschyl. Eum. 282. ἀφ' ἄγνοῦ στόματος εὐφήμεος καλῶ—'Αθηναίαν. Ἐκτενῶς, *ardently*, as Christ loved us.

23. ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου. These words assign a *reason* for this love. And ἀναγεγ. is for ἀναγ. γὰρ ἐστε. (Pott.) "For ye have been born again," i. e. of water and the Holy Spirit, and have attained a moral regeneration, which

is the pledge of eternal salvation, regenerated (I say) not of perishable seed, or by human means." This, Rosenm. observes, is levelled against the Jews, who boasted of their descent from Abraham. Compare Joh. 1, 13. 3, 6. Σποράς ἀφθάρτου, "imperishable and ever efficacious," i. e. as the Apostle adds, the λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, "the doctrine of the living God." The μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα may either refer to God (and so Grot. and Est., who cite Dan. 6, 26. αὐτὸς ἐστὶ Θεὸς ζῶν καὶ μένων), or to λόγου, i. e. the Gospel; and this method, which is adopted by Pisc., Vorst., Wolf, and almost all recent Critics, is more agreeable to the propriety of language and the context, especially the following citation from Isaiah: "Now this Gospel (annotates Rosenm.) remaineth for ever; for whatever God has said is for ever true and valid." The *application* is obvious. Λόγος ζῶν is for λ. ζωοποιῶν. See Acts 7, 38.

24, 25. The sentiment of the preceding verse is amplified by a passage of Is. 40, 5 & 7., in which, however, the words of the Prophet are probably *accommodated* to the present purpose; q. d. "these words of the Prophet Isaiah may, in a more excellent sense, hold good of the Gospel." The sense of the words is plain. Σὰρξ, our earthly, human nature, *man*. Δόξα ἀνθρώποις, man in his most glorious state, adorned with all that health, strength, beauty, riches, honours, learning, and eloquence can give him. Ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσε. These words are exegetical of the preceding; and the past tenses are used for presents, Hebraicè, or perhaps to suggest the *speed* of the falling away. See James 1, 11. Philologists compare the passage of Hom. II. §. 146., and others. The application is obvious.

25. τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, "But the word of the Lord is invariably true, always efficacious, and tending to eternal life and happiness." Τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς, "And that eternal truth is the very doctrine which is preached to you, i. e. (as Benson paraphrases) "I

am desirous that you should know what I mean by the seed of a spiritual and incorruptible life ; and by that word which renders men immortal, or makes them to endure for ever. And therefore, I expressly declare, I here mean the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

CHAP. II.

VER. 1, 2. Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν—καταλαλίας, " Seeing then that ye are regenerated by the word of truth, laying aside the vices which are so opposite to that state, as malice, guile, &c. Here ἀποτιθ. is used as at James 1, 21. Eph. 4, 22 and 25. Κακία, though a general term, yet, from the context, must here denote that *species* of evil, namely, *malice*. Now to this and other vices associated with it the Jews were too prone.

2. Ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε. This is said in conformity to the metaphor at 1, 23. Such they were, as being *recent* converts. The metaphor was used by the Jews, who (as will appear from the citations of Wets.) called new converts *sucklings*. On ἀρτιγ. see Pollux 2, 8. Τὸ λογικὸν γάλα is for τὸ τοῦ λόγου γ., the milk of the *Gospel*, which (especially in its elementary parts) is often so called. See 1 Cor. 3, 2. Hebr. 5, 12. and the notes. Whitby explains it of the milk which rational creatures feed upon : and he compares Rom. 12, 1. and James 1, 21. But something higher seems intended ; and this interpretation is (I think) not so proper as the former. Ἄδολον, *pure, sincere*, and therefore *salutary*, in opposition to the *mixed* and adulterated doctrines spoken of at 2 Cor. 2, 17. I would compare Æschyl. Ag. 94. ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις. In ἐπιποθήσατε, *earnestly desire*, the ἐπὶ is intensive. The *application* is obvious.

2. ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀύξηθῇτε, " that ye may make greater and greater progress in knowledge and virtue." In many MSS., Versions, and Fathers is added εἰς σω-

τηρίαν; which reading is adopted by almost all recent Critics. Yet, though it is well supported, I cannot but suspect it (with Mill and Wolf) to be a gloss; since for its *omission* in so many MSS. no reason can be imagined; but its *addition* is easily accounted for. Wolf moreover thinks, that, had the Apostle chose to add any thing further, he would have written εἰς ἀνδρα τέλειον; as Eph. 4, 13.

3. εἴπερ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος. Γεύεσθαι here signifies to know by taste, or experience; as Joseph. Ant. 2, 10, 3. Compare Ps. 39, 9. The sense is: "If indeed (as is the case) ye have experienced that the Lord is gracious and benignant; q. d. "As infants in experiencing the sweetness of the mother's milk, seek it the more, and love the mother the better; so ye Christians, who have experienced the salubrity of the milk of doctrine, are similarly affected towards Christ."

4, 5. πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι—Χριστοῦ.

It is rightly observed by Wolf and Pott, that these verses (in which, using the words of Ps. 118, 12. the Apostle proceeds to exhort Christians not only to *receive*, but also to *observe* the precepts of the Christian religion) are closely connected; the former containing a protasis; the latter, an apodosis. Rosenm. paraphrases thus: "A quo tempore Jesum, a primoribus Judæorum reprobatur, Deo autem carissimum, pro Messia agnovistis, eumque coluistis, ab eo tempore ipsi quoque Deo estis cari; estis pars societatis selectissimorum hominum, Deum secundum præcepta Christi colentium." The words (he continues) designate the dignity and excellence of Christians. Compare ver. 9. and Ps. 118, 22. Is. 8, 14. 38, 16. Matt. 21, 42. Eph. 2, 20. By the ἀνθρώπων, *men*, are meant the Jews, particularly those of the Sanhedrim, who rejected Jesus, though declared by God himself the Messiah. Παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν, "in the sight of God most excellent." Π. Θ. is a forensic metaphor. The προσέρχεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Κριστὸν, *come unto Christ*, who is here improperly called a living stone, is nothing more than believing in and professing his religion. Then as Christ is compared with a stone, so are Christians compared with the living stones of which the Temple was built, i. e. a society acknowledging Jesus for the Messiah.

Καὶ αὐτοὶ—πνευματικὸς, "Ye also are a part of the Temple, allegorically so called; are members of that Church and society of which Christ is the head and Lord. By the οἶκος πνευματικὸς is meant the universal Church, all Christians throughout the world. Not only (it is said) are Christians a part of this temple, but priests of it

themselves, i. e. as acceptable to God as those chosen priests of the Old Testament. Πνευματικὰς θυσίας, i. e. sacrifices offered from the heart (of which the antient ones were but types and shadows), and consisting of prayers and good works of every kind. (Rosenm.) See more in Pott, or in Whitby and Mackn., or the extracts in Slade. I would observe that there is a very similar expression to the παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν, ἐντίμον, in the Carmina Sybillina Edit. Gallæi. ἐκλεκτὸν παρὰ πατρὶ Θεῷ καὶ τίμον εἶναι, evidently an imitation, probably from interpolation; although I suspect that many of those Carmina are fabrications of the Monks of the middle ages. With the πνευματικὰς θυσίας I would compare Heb. 13, 16. τοιαύταις θυσίαις εὐαρετεῖται ὁ Θεός. Ps. 51, 17. and Aristid. 2, 278 B. καὶ (νομίζεν) μήτε θυσίαν οὕτω λαμπρὰν, μήτε σπονδὰς κεχαρισμένας, ὧν οὐχ ἡδίων ἂν εἶναι τοῖς θεοῖς, ἢ εἰ τὴν γνώμην ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν ὡς βελτίστην παρεχοίμεθα. A passage, supplying one among the many proofs that the publication of the Gospel raised the tone of morals among the philosophical and didactic writers of the Heathens, most of whom, there is no doubt, read and *profited* by the Scriptures; though very few, if any, vouchsafe to make the slightest allusion to them: a disingenuousness worthy of such a cause as they vainly endeavoured to prop up, by imparting to a false, sensual, and worn-out religion, those spiritualities which were peculiar to the *Gospel of truth*.

6. Returning to the subject of ver. 4., the Apostle shows that, in a passage of the Old Testament, Christ is compared with a corner-stone, and those who fly to this stone are declared blessed. (Pott.)

6. διότι καὶ περιέχει, for περιέχεται: an hypallage frequent in other verbs. Rosenm. compares Joseph. Ant. 11, 4, 7. where Darius is said to have sent an epistle to his Prefects, with the addition βούλομαι γίνεσθαι πάντα, καθὼς ἐν αὐτῇ περιέχει. See Raphel, Krebs, and Kypke. In Acts 8, 32. we have ἡ περιόχῃ τῆς γραφῆς. The citation which follows is from Is. 18, 16.; but it does not exactly correspond either with the Hebrew or the Sept., at least as we *now* have it. On the *connection* of the passage as it stands, Commentators exceedingly differ. See Pole, Wolf, at Pott. The passage is doubtless *accommodated* by the Apostle. Rosenm. observes, that according to the *primary* sense there is promised that defence and security which Jerusalem would afford to its inhabitants, and all who took refuge there from Sennacherib. Thus *Sion* signifies *Jerusalem*; and

the *stone* is a symbol of security. But in a *sublimier* sense, the words hold good of Christ, to whom all should take refuge who desire eternal salvation. Then *Sion* is the Jewish nation, from which Christ descended; and the *corner-stone* is Christ.

7, 8. ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, “That stone in respect of you has a price,” i. e. you know its price, while you know that Jesus is Lord and Messiah. Ἡ τιμὴ. Abstract for concrete ἐντιμὸς; alluding to what preceded. Ἀπείθουσι δὲ—σκανδάλου. Λίθον is for λίθος; a construction found in Matt. 21, 52. and 1 Cor. 10, 16.: or there may be an ellipsis of *quod attinet ad*. See the note on Matt. 21, 42. Now this, it is said, is made the *corner-stone*, on which any one *may* easily stumble: for although a corner-stone is placed in order to sustain the walls of an edifice, yet careless passers by *may* stumble upon it, to their injury; as the Jews had done, in stumbling at the humble birth and lowly estate of Jesus. Οἱ προσκόπτουσι τῷ λόγῳ, ἀπειθῶντες, “those who *stumble upon* are those who disbelieve the doctrine, rejecting both Jesus and his doctrine.” Εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν, “unto which (disbelief) they were destined.” A phrase derived from the usage of common life, by which things that happen by the permission of God, are referred to him, as the *doer* and *effector*. (Rosenm.) See Whitby, Benson, Carpz., and Pott. I would observe that the ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν *may* be rendered: “To you, therefore, who believe, is this preciousness.” The τιμὴ is for ἐντιμὸς. Of this sense there is an example in Plut. Is. § 5. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω τιμὴ Αἰγυπτίοις ὥς ὁ Νεῖλος, where Reiske causelessly conjectures τίμιον. And so ἀτιμία for ἄτιμον in 1 Cor. 2, 15. With respect to the εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν, the above explanation of it may (I think) be admitted. At all events, it is ably rescued from doctrinal perversion by the Greek Fathers and Commentators. To the Scholiast cited by Matt. and Slade I add Œcumen. whose exposition, however, is too long for me to insert.

9. ὑμεῖς δὲ, γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον. Γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, *a beloved people*. Taken from Is. 43, 20., where the term is used of the Israelites. Now it is yet more applicable to *Christians*. Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, “as Priests of the Great King of Kings.” An appellation taken from Exod. 19, 6. Sept., and applicable to Christians, as worshipping the true God in a more excellent way than did the Israelitish Priests of old. Ἔθνος ἅγιον. See supra, 1, 15. Taken from Deut. 7, 6. and 14, 2. Λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. Taken from Exod. 19, 5. where the Sept. have λαὸς περιούσιος. But at Malach. 3, 17. they render the same noun הָלַל by εἰς περιποίησιν. See the note on Acts 20, 28. Ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς—φῶς, “That ye should show forth (by words and deeds) the praises of him who hath called (and drawn) you from the darkness (of ignorance, sin, and misery,) to the light (of knowledge, truth, and happiness).” Τὰς ἀρετὰς, the praises, glories, exalted attributes of God; Is. 42, 8. (in the Hebr. and Sept.) and 42, 12. ἀρετὰς ἀναγγελεῖν. Schleus. also cites Is. 63, 7. τὰς ἀρετὰς Κυρίου ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἡμῖν ἀνταποδίδωσι. (To which I add Thucyd. 2, 40. τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀποδῶσων, i. e. εὐνοϊαν, χάριν. Other examples from Josephus and the Classical writers may be seen in Krebs. Ed.) Now if it was the duty of the Priests to celebrate the praises of the great God, how much more ought *Christians*, whose dignity is greater than that of those Priests. See 4, 11. Θαυμαστὸν, admirable, worthy of all admiration. (Rosenm.) See Doddr.

10. οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, “Who formerly were not a people of God, but now *are* so; who *were* not (formerly) received into favour and made a people of God, but now have been made so.” The words are taken from Hos. 2, 25., but accommodated (as the best Commentators say; see Pott, Rosenm., and Doddr.) to the Gentile Christians. Compare 9, 25. where see the note. They are, however, applicable to Jewish as well as Gentile converts. The *application* is obvious. See Benson, Pott, and Rosenm., or Slade.

11. The Apostle now presses on them another admonition, namely, to abstain from lasciviousness, that so they might remove the suspicion of immorality which the Heathens entertained respecting them. (Pott.)

The *πάροικοι* are those who reside out of their country; the *παρεπίδημοι*, those who are staying, or sojourning, out of it. Others explain the *πάροικοι*, *private guests*, as opposed to *ξένοι*, public ones. Slade thinks it appears from the next verse, and from the whole tenour of the Epistle, that the Apostle intends a primary reference to the state of dispersion in which his brethren then were; it being especially incumbent on them to be circumspect in their conduct, for the honour and recommendation of their religion in a foreign land. But that makes a very frigid reason for their abstaining, &c.; and Mr. Slade took an incorrect view of the reasoning of Grot., from whom he adduces an extract. That Commentator, and from him Pott and Rosenm. steer a middle course between the interpretation of Slade and the common one, by which the Apostle is supposed to speak of life as a pilgrimage. The Apostle (they say) reminds them of their situation as *πάροικοι* and *παρεπίδημοι* in a foreign country, and also of their like situation in this world, as compared with the next; and then in the next verse takes occasion, from their situation as Christian strangers in Heathen countries, to press on them the duty of adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. Here Loesn. compares Philo 5, 18 D. To which I add Eephantès ap. Stob. Serm. 323, 49. ἐπὶ δὲ γῆς ἀπωκίσμενον χρεῖμα. Cic. de Senect. meminerimus nos venire in hanc vitam tanquam in hospitium, non tanquam in domum. Natura enim hic commorandi diversorium, non habitandi locum nobis dedit. Hebr. 11, 13. ὡς ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι.

11. ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. These are the ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκὸς at Gal. 5, 26., denoting not only lasciviousness, but sensuality of every kind. The

αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς assigns the *reason why*, namely, since these militate against and are repugnant to the welfare of their souls. Here Pott rightly recognises a military metaphor, by which lusts are considered as the *enemies* of the mind. And he compares Marc. Anton. 2, 17. ὁ δὲ βίος πόλεμος. He and most recent Commentators take the ψυχῆς to mean *mind* and *reason*; which however yields a cold and frigid sense, not at all suitable to the *Apostle*; though it be true that the indulgence of these lusts is contrary to reason, and the happiness of man in *this world*: in which view Wets. adduces several Classical citations.

12. τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς—καλήν.

See the note on James 3, 13. Ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, “in the sight of the Heathens, who are close observers and severe censors of your actions.” Ἴνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν—ἐπισκοπῆς. The ἐν ᾧ, like the Hebr. באשר, signifies *inasmuch as, whereas*. See Wets. Καταλαλ., “they calumniate.” I would point: ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων, ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσι: for at ἐποπτ. must be understood, not (as Rosenm. supposes) ὑμᾶς, but αὐτὰ, i. e. τὰ καλὰ ἔργα; as is clear from a kindred passage at 3, 2. ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν. Ἐποπτεύω signifies to *closely inspect*: so that ἐποπτεύσαντες is for ἐὰν ἐποπτεύσωσι, i. e. upon close inspection, and severe scrutiny. By this means (it is said) they may be led to *glorify God*, by which, (I agree with Beza, Calvin, and Rosenm.,) is meant give glory and praise to, and conceive highly of that God and religion whereof they before thought and spoke evil of. For δοξάζειν is, as Rosenm. observes, used of divine worship of every kind. It is strange none of the Commentators should have cited a kindred passage in 1 Cor. 14, 25. where, after a similar dissipation of Heathen prejudices, it is added: καὶ οὕτω, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, προσκυνήσει τῷ Θεῷ, ἀπαγγέλλων ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὄντως ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι. Now in this passage the προσκυν. expresses that *first and faint kind of worship* which succeeds to some conviction of the truth.

As to the ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς, of this phrase, the sense is much controverted. See Pole's Synopsis; and Benson or Slade. Some understand by it the *day of judgment*. But, as Benson says, it plainly denotes something in *this life*. Others, as Whitby and Mackn., take it of the *time of persecution*. Schleus. Grot., Benson, and Jaspis, of the *infliction of divine punishment*. (See more in Grot. and Benson). But that does not suit the δόξα2. The two best founded interpretations seem to be, 1. that of Wolf, Hamm., Raphel, Carpz., Slade, &c., who take it to allude to *persecution* (see the details in Slade); 2, that of Pisc., Calv., Menoch, Est., Ger., Beza, Dodd., Pott, and Rosenm., who interpret: “when God shall mercifully visit them with a conviction of the truth and blessings of the Gospel.” The very same expression

occurs, and in the same sense, at Luke 1, 66, 78. 7, 16, 19, 44. Acts 15, 14. Now this is surely quite agreeable to the context ; nor is it (I think) open to any serious objections ; for such I cannot consider those of Benson and Slade.

13, 14. The Apostle now proceeds to illustrate the general precept of ver. 11 and 12. by the particular duties to be observed among the Heathens both by Jewish and Gentile Christians. (Pott.)

13. ὑποτάγητε. A passive in an hithpahel, or reciprocal, sense, “subject yourselves.” Πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, “to every institution or ordinance of man,” i. e. every political institution. A sort of Hebraism, Rosenm. observes, from ברא, *ordinare*, Sir. 38, 12. And so the Latin *creare magistratum*. The ἀνθρ. signifies that which is constituted by men, by which is meant *government*, or those by whom it is administered, as kings, governors, and magistrates in general ; for, in a popular sense, the κτίσις will apply to all. Now on this interpretation the antients and nearly all the moderns are agreed. Yet Pott objects that this sense of κτίσις is devoid of authority. And he would take πάσῃ ἀνθρ. κτ. to mean “all men.” But this is liable to far more serious objections. Compare similar admonitions in Rom. 13, 1. and Tit. 3, 1.

13. διὰ τὸν Κύριον, “out of regard to the injunction of the Lord,” (at Matt. 22, 21. ; see also Matt. 17, 27.) This had probably been given in Peter’s hearing ; but if *not*, it could not fail to come to his knowledge. Βασιλεὺς is, by the usage of the Greek and Hebr. (So מלך), used to denote the *Imperator Romanus*, because he enjoyed that absolute power which centered in the βασιλεὺς and מלך. Ὑπερέχοντι, *Sovereign Lord*. By the ἡγεμ. are denoted provincial governors of every class, chiefly the Legati Cæsaris, or the Proconsuls. See more in Pott and Rosenm., or the works on Roman Antiquities. Δι’ αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοις, “sent out by him (i. e. Cæsar) and deputed to govern.” This, Rosenm. observes, is mentioned, that in case of civil commotion they

may know to whom obedience is primarily due." The words εἰς ἐκδίκησιν μὲν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν advert to the only legitimate end and purpose of all regular government, (see Rom. 13, 3 and 4.); though there have been in all ages exceptions. So, in an interesting citation from Ulpian adduced (from Lardner) by Benson, government is defined to be the power of punishing evil doers, facinorosos homines. Now if any governors fail in their bounden duty, by *not* punishing evil doers, or by *evil treating* those that do well, they must answer for the crime in another world, and meet the consequences even in this.

15. ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιούντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν. Ἀγαθοποιεῖν often signifies to confer benefits; here it simply denotes *well doing*. Φιμοῦν, *to reduce to silence*, i. e. to leave them nothing to object. A frequent signification in the New Testament. See Schleus. Lex. or Wahl. Ἀγνωσίαν, i. e. objection arising from ignorance or prejudice. Ἀφρόνων, *foolish*, without knowledge of the religion they revile.

16. ὡς ἐλεύθεροι—Θεοῦ. Ἐλευθ. *free*, viz. from vices; as Joh. 8, 33 and 36. Rom. 6, 18 and 22. The Christians, too, were free from the yoke of the Mosaic Law, and from the necessity of worshipping the gods of the Gentiles. But the Jews affected *political* liberty; saying that God was their only King: whence St. Peter adds: καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, "not making use of your Christian liberty as a cloak for evil (i. e. sedition), as some Jewish Christians did, who expecting a political kingdom, visible on the earth, were apt to suppose Christians to be free from all public laws, κυριότητα ἀθετοῦντες, as says Jude (Rosenm. from Benson). Ἐπικάλυμμα, *cloak*, pretext to shroud secret and evil designs. Ὡς δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, "as bound to the observance of the divine laws;" and thence subject to those whom God orders us to serve. For it is the will of God that there should be magistrates whom we may obey.

17. πάντας τιμῆσατε, "Honour all," i. e. to whom honour is due; as Rom. 13, 7. A *general* injunction, afterwards explained by its *species*. Τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε, "love the Christian fraternity." Abstract for concrete. (Rosenm.) Τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε. This term in Scripture unites the kindred notions of *reverence* and *obedience*. It is also included in τιμᾶτε. Pott. here cites Soph. Aj. 653. and Artabanus ap. Plut. in Themistocl. p. 125. Ἡμῶν δὲ πολλῶν νόμων καὶ καλῶν ὄντων, κάλλιστος οὗτος ἐστὶ τὸ τιμᾶν βασιλέα, καὶ προσκυνεῖν εἰκόνα Θεοῦ, τοῦ τὰ πάντα σώζοντος.

18. οἱ οἰκέται, ὑποτασσόμενοι—σκολιοῖς. Now since the conduct of Christian servants or slaves would be likely to influence the opinions of their superiors respecting Christianity, it therefore became a matter of importance; and hence the injunctions of St. Peter and St. Paul.

The article οἱ stands for the pronoun ὑμεῖς; as often in St. Paul's Epistles. The οἰκέται are supposed to be the domestic slaves. But the term might include *freedmen* acting in the capacity of domestics. At ὑποτασσόμενοι must be understood ἐστε. Ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ, "with all reverence and submission." Πᾶς expresses the highest degree of any thing. Σκολιοῖς, literally *crooked*, and, in a metaphorical sense, *awkward*, *perverse*, *morose*, χαλέποις, δυσκόλοις.

19. τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, "for αὐτὸ γὰρ χάρις, scil. ἐστὶ," says Pott, who also observes that the words admit of various senses; but he finally acquiesces in the following: "For this is acceptable (to God), and conciliates his favour." A sense required by the ποιοῦν γὰρ κλέος at ver. 20., and on which both the antients and the best moderns are agreed. Here Θεῷ must be understood, which is *expressed* in some MSS. (by a gloss); literally, "for this is a favour laid up with God, and will be rewarded by him. The διὰ συνείδησιν Rosenm. explains, "from his consciousness of what he owes to God." Pott takes it to mean the *mens conscia Numinis*. The *former* interpretation seems

preferable; but the expression may be explained with Schleus., “ob religionem quam Deus postulat.” (So Rom. 13, 5. ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν,) “from a principle of religion, to do the will of God, and discharge that duty.” And so Theodoret. Λύπας is for τὰ λυπήρὰ, *grievances*; as Gen. 3, 16.

20. ποῖον γὰρ κλέος—ὑπομενεῖτε, “For what praise is it, if ye be roughly treated for your *faults*, ye bear it patiently?” Κολαφίζεσθαι may denote the various modes both by words and actions, by which slaves were chastised for ill conduct. Ἀγαθοποιεῖν must denote “discharging your duty.” Καὶ πάσχοντες, “and yet suffer ill treatment.” At the former ὑπομενεῖτε must be understood κολαφίζεσθαι, at the latter πάσχειν, both taken from the context. Pott adduces Senec. de benef. 4, 11.

21—23. The Apostle now supplies them with a strong motive to this obedience, appealing to the example of *Christ*, for their imitation, who bore keener contumelies, and more grievous sufferings with unshaken constancy. (Pott.)

21. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, “For to this purpose, and on this condition, ye were made Christians, that ye should follow the footsteps of Christ, and bear all trials for conscience sake. “Ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν—αὐτοῦ, “Christ suffered for your sake, and for your salvation, not for his own advantage.” Ὑπογραμμὸς signifies properly a *faint chalked outline* for a painter to fill up, or a slight model for an architect to go by: but it denotes, in a general way, an *exemplar*, a *copy*. The word is adduced from Polycarp and Clem. Rom. by Schleus. Lex. Of these passages the former is an imitation of the present one.

22. ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν—αὐτοῦ. These words (which are from Is. 53, 9.) simply signify, “who sinned neither in word nor deed, who suffered without having committed any crime.”

23. ὃς λοιδορούμενος—δικαίως. See Matt. 26, 63 and 68. 27, 12, 29 and 39. seq. Πάσχων οὐκ ἡπείλει, “when suffering ignominy, stripes, nay crucifixion,

uttered not a minatory or oburgatory expression." Ἀντιλοιδορέω is a rare word. At παραδίδου there is an ellipsis, which most antients and moderns supply by κρίσιν, or τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ. See Benson. Others, as Beza, Bos, and Pott, understand ἐαυτὸν. And this they might have supported from the words, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." The sense is much the same.

24. ὁς τὰς ἁμαρτίας—ξύλον. Ἄμαρτία stands for the *punishment* of sin; as Joh. 9, 41. 15, 22 & 24. Acts 22, 16. Ἀναφέρειν is a *stronger* term for φέρειν. Ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, "at," or "on, the cross." No passage can more emphatically declare the glorious doctrine of the *atonement* (the key-stone of the Gospel) than the present, on which I can only *refer* the reader to the admirable note of Whitby.

Ἰνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, "that we being freed from the dominion of sin, might live unto righteousness," i. e. perpetually exercise ourselves therein. So Rosenm., from Beza and Schmid. But it is far better, with the antients and, of the moderns, Wolf, Raphel, &c. and recently Pott and Slade, to take ἀπογ. in the sense *die* (by an euphemism), which is frequent in Herodotus. See examples in Raphel, Krebs, and Wets. This is also confirmed by Rom. 6, 2 & 10. ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. and 6, 11. νεκροὶ εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, i. e. wholly abstain from sin. Οὗ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθητε, "by whose stripes and miseries your wounds are healed," i. e. ye obtain salvation. Taken from Is. 53, 6. Μώλωψ properly signifies a *pinch*, and the bruise and smart resulting.

25. ἥτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενα—ὁμῶν. From Is. 53, 6. The sense is: "For ye were as stray sheep, without pasture, exposed to peril, and without protection." A fine image of complete misery, and utter destitution. The comparison of disciples with *sheep* is frequent. See Pott's examples. Classical passages in illustration of the propensity of sheep to wander are very numerous. See the Phi-

lologists. Ἐπεστράφητε, "ye are returned." Ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. "Now the ἐπίσκ. τῶν ψυχῶν (annotates Rosenm.) takes care of the souls, as the shepherd does of the sheep." The καὶ is explicative. Here there is a mixture of the image and the thing compared: and ἐπίσκ. is added, to explain *how* Christ is our *shepherd*. On this passage see the note of Mackn. or Slade.

CHAP. III.

VER. 1, 2. From hence to ver. 7. follow the duties of wives to husbands, and husbands to wives.

1. αἰγυναικες, ὑποτασσόμεναι. Here again we have the participle for the verb, and the article for the pronoun. In the ἰδίῳ there is an Hebrew pleonasm. See 1 Thess. 2, 14. and Eph. 5, 22. Benson, however, thinks it has some force. By the *subjection* here enjoined is meant such as is agreeable to the customs and laws in force in any country. Yet the term never authorises more than ready and willing obedience, not *slavish* subjection. In which view Rosenm. cites Joseph. Ant. 1, 49, 8. (of the maidens of Leah and Rachel) δοῦλαι μὲν οὐδαμῶς, ὑποτεταγμέναι δέ. On the inferiority of the female sex Joseph. adv. Ap. 2. (cited by Pott) shows that the Mosaic law speaks decidedly. Ἀναστροφῆς, scil. καλῆς, "virtuous conduct." Ἄνευ λόγου, "without (further) proof, argument, or exhortation." For such fruits of the Gospel supply a tacit, but powerful proof of its beneficial tendency, and a *popular* argument for its truth. And (as Benson remarks) indeed in all times and places, the way to recommend religion is not so much to *talk of* it, as to *live* according to one's profession. See the whole note. Κερδηθήσονται, "may be gained, or won over." So Matt. 18, 15. ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου· and 1 Cor. 9, 19. Of course, it is nearly equivalent to σώζειν, "put in the way of sal-

vation." That Christian wives were often such, we find even from Liban. (cited by Grot.): "Proh, quales feminas habent Christiani!"

2. ἐπιπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν. These words are exegetical of the preceding. The sense is: "when they see your chastity, respectful obedience, and other virtues." At ἐν φόβῳ some, as Pott, subaud Θεοῦ.

3. ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἑξῶθεν, ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν, καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων, ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος. Compare a kindred passage at 1 Tim. 2, 9. Ἐμπλ. τρίχων, i. e. the curling, plaiting, and other ornamental disposition of the hair, like the πλέγματα, *braids, locks*, of the above passage. The τὰ χρυσία are explained by Rosenm. of all the ornaments of female attire; and he cites from Demosth.: χρυσία καλὰ ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἱμάτια καλὰ. And he remarks (after Kypke) that as περιθέσεως is united, the χρυσ. must especially mean *head ornaments*, all of which, as we find from Pollux 5, 16. were of gold; and sometimes the hair was powdered with gold dust." So Philo 689. (cited by Pott.) περιτιθέναι τὸν κλῆρον, ὡς ἀνεί κόσμον ἑξῶθεν. To the above I would add, that these head ornaments are only *specimens* of the kind of κόσμος ὁ ἑξῶθεν, which is to be made subservient to the *inner adorning*.

On the various female ornaments, as combs, bracelets, necklaces, and a hundred other such ornaments, of which some conception may be formed from a passage of Isaiah on this subject, and the various articles dug up at Herculaneum and Pompeii, this is no place to treat, though I have noted down a vast number of curious passages. I shall, however, just introduce such as relate to the ornaments for the *hair*. Most of my readers will remember the Virgilian "crines nodantur in aurum;" and "erinem—implicat auro." That *gold* was very antiently worn in the hair we find from Hom. II. B. 872. Herod. 1, 82. and Thucyd. 1, 6. χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐνέρσει κρωβύλον ἀναδύμενοι τῶν ἐν κεφαλῇ τριχῶν. Sometimes in the form of a *crown*: as we find from Artemid. 2, 9. where see Reisk. So also Joseph. 626, 30. καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κεκοσμήμενος τῇ συνθέσει τῆς κόμης· and 908, 42. This wearing of gold in the hair was, however, especially in use among *prostitutes*. So Pollux 4, 153. ἡ δὲ διάχρυσος ἑταῖρα, πολὺν ἔχει τὸν χρυσὸν ἐπὶ τῇ κόμῃ. And from Tabula sexta Instit. Justinian 10. we find that the lawyers

wished to *confine* it to them. The words are as follows: "Aurum et pietas vestes matronæ non gestant, sed tantum meretrices." We may, however, suppose that these juriconsults were not very successful in their attempts to legislate for the regulation of female attire. I can only *refer* to a beautiful and true sentiment in Philostr. Imag. p. 823. where for ἀειδῶς I conjecture ἀηδῶς. And I must conclude with the following pretty passage in the Præcepta nuptialia of Naumachius: Μὴ σὺ πότε χρυσῷ περιμάνεο, μητ' ἐπὶ δειρῆς πορφυρέην ὑάκινθον ἔχῃς, ἢ χλωρὸν ἴασπιν. Χρυσὸς τοι κόνις ἐστὶ καὶ ὕργυρος· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ λῆες ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πολυψηφίδι θαλάσσης· where I would observe the Poet seems to have had in view Eurip. Hec. 154. παρθένον ἐκ χρυσοφόρου δειρῆς.

4. ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου—πολυτελής. The ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου is the same with the ὁ ἔσω ἀνθρώπου of St. Paul, Rom. 7, 22., the *mind*, *heart*. At ἐν ἀφθάρτῳ must be understood κόσμῳ. Here internal and mental is put in opposition to external ornament; q. d. "Vests easily fade, and wear out; but the internal ornament is ever during." (Rosenm.) It is in the words of the Poet,

"A wreath that cannot fade, of flowers that bloom
With most success when all beside decay."

It is well observed too, by Bens., that "a great part of religion consists in the government of the passions, and regulating the temper of the mind: and such a *dress* of the inward man is *incorruptible*. Whereas the richest ornaments will wear out and perish."

4. τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, "a meek and quiet disposition." This sense of πνεῦμα occurs also in 1 Cor. 4, 21. and Gal. 6, 1. The Θεοῦ is *emphatical*, involving an opposition to the preference too often given to external over internal excellences. And yet meekness and a quiet spirit (as opposed to a petulant and pragmatical one) is much lauded in the Classical writers.

5. οὕτω γὰρ πότε καὶ αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες—ἐαυτὰς. By the ἅγαι γυναῖκες are meant the wives of the Patriarchs, of whom we read in holy writ. Αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, a periphrasis for "true worshippers of God." Ὑποτασσόμενοι, "as being also in subjection

(and were also in subjection), how much more ought *Christian* wives?"

6. *ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσε τῷ Ἀβραάμ, Κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα*, "Thus, for example (*ὡς* being for *οὕτως*), Sarah was obedient to Abraham, calling him Lord," *וְכָךְ*, Gen. 18, 12. Which is noticed in the Rabbinical writers. *ὑπακούειν* is here used for *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*. Elsn., Wets., and Pott prove from Plut. 2, 252 B. and Aristoph. Ep. 565., that the Greek wives called their husbands *κυρίους*; nay, as we find from Eurip. Med. 223. Hal. 578. and Ach. Tat. 309., *δεσπότης*. And they might have added that the Roman wives called their husbands *dominos*, as I think we may infer from Virg. *Æn.* 4, 214. *Conubia nostra repulit, ac dominum Æneam in regna recepit*; and 4, 10. Phrygio *servire* marito. This extreme subjection seems to have been kept up longest in the East, where customs never change; but was early laid aside in the hardy countries of the North; for from the Germania of Tacitus it appears that the situation there of wives differed little from what it is in civilized countries of Europe at the present day; except that the former might be said to have more open power, the latter more secret influence.

As to the names by which husbands are to be addressed by their wives, the Apostle's words are not to be supposed authoritative. Reverence and obedience are the bounden duty of wives; and the *expression* of this, as being made in terms purely conventional, may very well vary with manners and customs of different ages. See the note on Matt. 18, 17.

The words *ἀγαθοποιῶσαι, καὶ μὴ φοβοῦμεναι μηδεμίαν πτοίησιν*, are somewhat obscure, and have been variously interpreted. By some, as Gatak., they are understood of voluntary and uncompulsory subjection. But this is harsh. See other interpretations stated and refuted in Bens. and Pott. Some there are (as Dodd. observes) who think this clause is suggested as an argument to persuade them to *do well*, that they would be preserved from those alarms and terrors which a perverse and rebellious contest with superior power may bring with it, and which would indeed prove as injurious to their peace as to their character. Rosenm. explains: "*si rectè agetis, nullis perterritæ minis*," nempe maritorum infide-

lium, si forte ad abnegandam fidem religioni datam vos cogere vellent. I should prefer, with Est. and Calvin, to understand it of a firmness and intrepidity of character which would be necessary to support their religious independence, when united to Heathen husbands. The *πτοίησιν* is well explained by Calvin of that weak timidity which fosters causeless fear, and is too often found in the female sex.

7. The Apostle now treats on the duties of *husbands*. Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν. 'Ὅμοίως is for *πάλιν* or *ὡσαυτῶς*. Συνοικεῖν signifies to live in wedlock, including all conjugal duties and offices. To detail the Heathen notions of marriage, as compared with those of the Gospel, were here out of place. Κατὰ γνώσιν, i. e. in a manner suitable to that superior knowledge (as enlightened by the Gospel) which they possess over the Pagans. Bens. and Pott take it for *ἐν γνώσει*, "prudently, discreetly, and indulgently;" as 2 Cor. 6, 6. And the latter compares it with other adverbial phrases formed by *κατὰ* and a substantive.

7. ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν.

Σκεῦος, like the Heb. כֵּל, signifies properly "something made for use, an *utensil*." Hence it is generally supposed to designate the wife, as the *utensil*, or, *tool* for serving the purposes of the husband. And so, they remark, Aristotle calls the wife the *ὄργανον* of the husband. I cannot, however, help thinking, that as *σκεῦος* simply signifies *any thing made*, so it may here only mean a *creature*. Thus the sense will be, that "woman is the weaker creature." And so, I find, Benson. In proof of the *fact* we need not the operose citations of Wolf, Schoettg., and Wets. With respect to the words *ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν*, they seem meant to further explain the former. It is plain that the sense of *τιμὴ*, (as being a very extensive term,) must be determined by the context and the subject: and the best Commentators, from Bp. Hall to Slade and Valpy, are agreed that it must here denote that indulgent care and respect which is shown to valuable but fragile articles; as Lib. Mus.: Sicut honor quidam habitur crystallinis, quia sollicitè tractantur; and *honorare uxorem* is used by many Rabbinical writers. See Schoettg. and Wets. And, besides other examples of *ἀπονέμειν* (*tribuere*) *τιμὴν*, they cite Epict. 62. *τιμῶνται αἱ γυναῖκες ὑπὸ τῶν ἄνδρων*. But there the term is used in its *proper* sense. They might have more aptly cited Philo 2, 36, 9. (of Abraham with respect to Sarah) *διὰ τὴν τιμὴν ἣν ἀπένευμε τῇ γαμέτῃ*. Eurip. *Troas* 735. *ὦ φίλτατ', οὐ πέρισσα τιμηθεὶς τέκνον'* & Orest. 449. *παῖδ' ἀγκαλαῖσι περιφέρων, τιμῶν τε*. Eurip. *Med.* 657. *φίλους τιμᾶν*. And so Rom. 12, 10. *τῇ τιμῇ*

προηγούμενους ἀλλήλους, where it denotes the duties of benevolence and courtesy.

It is then added, to further show why they should be thus respectfully and indulgently treated (and not *despotically*, as if naturally inferior and without souls), that they are *fellow-heirs* with them of the grace of life and salvation, and destined to the same future felicity. A *further* reason is added in εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν (for such appears to be the true reading, instead of the ἐκκόπτ. of many MSS., Versions, and Fathers), namely, that mutual disagreements indispose the mind for that heartfelt prayer which can alone be effectual, and draw down a blessing from the God of peace. Ἐγκόπτειν signifies to cut off any one's course, and consequently to *hinder, impede* it. As to the var. lect. ἐκκόπτ., it only denotes *cutting out*, and *destroying*. Now the former is the only suitable sense. Many examples are adduced, by Schoettg., of similar expressions in the Rabbinical writers; as: "Num præces quædam abscinduntur?" There *may* be (as Doddr. thinks) an allusion to social or family prayer, for which such dissensions greatly unfit Christians.

8. The Apostle now, from hence to ver. 13., gives some general directions, which concerned *all the Christians*; exhorting them to mutual affection and concord; and to a kind treatment of all men, even of their enemies and persecutors, as the most likely way to soften them, and to obtain the Divine approbation. (Benson.)

Τὸ τέλος is usually rendered *denique, finally*. But the discourse does not draw to a conclusion. The context seems to require the version of Erasm., Vatab., Zeger, Grot., Bens., Rosenm., and Pott, *in summa, summam*. So the Classical ἐν κεφαλαίῳ Rosenm. refers to Num. 31, 37—41., where it is used to address the Heb. מִנְיָן. And he adds that after the *particular* duties, as of children, servants, wives, and husbands, the Apostle subjoins those which concern *all* the classes. Ὁμόφρονες denotes *mutual concord*. Συμπαθεῖς, "have a kind of sympathy in each other's sorrows;" as Rom. 12, 5 & 15. 1 Cor. 12, 26. Heb. 10, 33 & 34. Φιλάδελφοι, see 1, 22. and the note there. This denotes *benignant courtesy*. Others, indeed, read ταπεινοφρόνες, which most Critics prefer. But the common reading, (I agree with Bens.,) seems the more suitable to the

context. Nor do I see in what it is difficult to account for the diversity.

9. μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ—κληρονομήσητε. See Rom. 12, 17. and the note. And on εὐλογούντες see Matt. 5, 44. Εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε, “For to this end were ye called, that ye should obtain a blessing, i. e. every sort of felicity; therefore it behoves you to wish and pray for blessings upon others.”

10. ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν, καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς—δόλον. By the last words εἰδότες ὅτι—κληρονομήσητε being put in a parenthesis, the connexion here will be clearer; for on the words λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας the Apostle engrafts an exhortation to curb the tongue (in expressions borrowed from Ps. 34, 13 & 14. Compare the words with the Heb. and Sept.). Rosenm. would read, with the Syr., ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν, καὶ ἀγαπῶν ἰδεῖν, &c. And this is plainer, and more agreeable to the Sept.: but as there is no authority for it, it seems to be a mere emendation. The Apostle appears to have blended the two clauses into one: and we may render: “he that would fain enjoy life,” &c. A sense also (I find) assigned by Mackn.; and, though I know no authority for it, it seems to be required by the context; the words being exegetical. Πausάτω, *stop, repress*. The primary sense of παύω and which often occurs in the Classical writers. Κακοῦ, *reviling*. Δόλον, *falsehood*. On this passage see an apposite Rabbinical citation in Rosenm., and the note of Dodd.

11, 12. ἐκκλινάτω ἀπὸ κακοῦ—αὐτῇν. Taken from Ps. 34., with a change of person. Ζητησάτω εἰρήνην, “strive after peace and concord.” Διώκειν imports strenuously endeavouring to attain at.

12. ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου—κακά. The ὀφθ. suggests intent observance and watching over; and ὦτα implies readiness to hearken to their petitions. Compare Joh. 9, 31. James 5, 16. I would also subjoin an elegant passage of Herodian, 7, 3, 7. ἦν δὲ καὶ τοῖς

ὥσὶ κοῦφος ἐς διάβολας. The πρόσωπον is intended, (per anthropopathian), to set forth more strongly the displeasure of the Lord against evil doers ; since by this expression anger is denoted. Ἐπὶ, against them, i. e. for their punishment and destruction ; as, indeed, is added in one MS. and the two Syriac Versions, but from the margin.

13. The Apostle now subjoins some further inducements to a virtuous and holy life. (Pott.) Καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μιμηταὶ γένησθε ; “ And who (ordinarily) will harm you, if ye be followers of what is good and right ? Few or none.” Ἄλλ’ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, “ But even if ye *suffer* in the cause of *virtue*, or of your religion.” (Matt. 5, 10) This, as Rosenm. observes, is a reply to an objection, that magistrates would harm them even for what was *good*. Μακάριοι, “ happy are ye.” There seems to be a reference to the words of our Lord, Matt. 5, 10.

14. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε. These and the words following Κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεὸν—ὑμῶν are from Is. 8, 12 & 18. Φόβος here is for φοβη-τρὸν, *terriculamentum* ; as Rom. 13, 3. See also Jude 23. and the examples of Pott, to which I add Artemid. 3, 66. p. 301. Athen. 316 E. Liban. Or. Parent. 9, 106. fin.

15. Κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, “ Dominum Deum sanctè colite.” Ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις Rosenm. renders, *animo candido, sincero*. But this is too feeble. It rather means (according to the antients and most moderns), *to themselves*, in their secret retirements, and for their private comfort under all circumstances, whether prosperous or adverse. To this the Apostle adds : ἔτοιμοι δὲ (scil. ἔστε) πρὸς ἀπολογίαν, where Rosenm. supplies “ religionis vestræ.” But that is not necessary ; since (as Pott observes) πρὸς ἀπολογίαν is put for εἰς τὸ δοῦναι λόγον. If there were any ellipsis, I would supply τῆς ἐλπίδος, from ἐλπίδος just after, which Rosenm. in-

interprets *religion*; referring to Acts 26, 7. But in both cases it is a needless refinement.

Now the reply is directed to be made μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, “so that ye do it meekly and respectfully, not in an insulting, contemptuous, dogmatical spirit.”

16. συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν, “Taking care to have a good conscience.” Ἴνα ἐν ᾧ—κακοποιῶν, “so that in that whereof they speak against you, as evil doers, they who thus calumniate your virtues and Christian behaviour may be ashamed.” Compare a kindred passage at 2, 12.

17, 18. κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιοῦντας—κακοποιοῦντας. The Apostle here, by a tacit prolepsis, comforts the Christians under the injuries of the profane, by an argument derived from the will of God and the example of Christ. Κρεῖττον, *preferable*. The sense may be thus expressed: “He who suffers for crimes can expect no recompense; but he who suffers for God may look forward to a *great* one with confidence.” Ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθε, q. d. “If Christ suffered for us who were then evil, how much more should we be prepared to die, or suffer tribulation, for the glory of Christ and the edification of Christians.” Ἴνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, “that he might reconcile us unto God, and make us acceptable worshippers.” For as προσέρχεσθαι Θεῷ signifies to *worship God*, so προσάγειν signifies to render any one fit to worship him [literally, “to introduce any one to the throne of God;” a metaphor taken from *Courts*. Edit.] With respect to σαρκὶ and πνεύματι, they are variously interpreted. The latter term sometimes denotes *soul*: but σὰρξ often signifies the *human nature*; and then the πνεῦμα will be the *divine spirit*, the *divine nature* of Christ. Accordingly, *some* explain: “he was put to death in respect to the body, but preserved alive in respect to the soul;” the term ζωοποιεῖν (they observe) often signifying not only *vivify*, care,

but also, like the Heb. *חַיָּה*, *in vitâ conservare*. Others : " he died in respect to his human nature, but was recalled to life by his divine spirit," i. e. by the divine energy that was in him. " Now *σὰρξ* (say they) very frequently denotes *humility, humanity*. Then *πνεῦμα* denotes *majesty*, and, as the subject is of Christ, *the divine essence of Christ*. Thus *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* is ascribed to Christ, Heb. 9, 14., as well as, ch. 7, 16., *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*." But the context seems to require *τὴν σάρκα* to be interpreted *body*; and *τὸ πνεῦμα*, *animum*; with this sense : " Christ, in respect to the body, was, indeed, put to death, but in respect to the mind he was preserved alive." (Rosenm.) And so Michaelis and Bp. Middleton : " carnally dead, but alive spiritually;" which is supported by most of the antient versions. See also Bp. Horsley's Serm. 30. And this appears, upon the whole, to be the true sense : though several objections are made by Mr. Slade on the score of want of authority," &c.

19, 20. *ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν*.

This passage is thought to present great difficulties, which the Commentators attempt, in various ways, to remove. Some resort to critical conjecture, which merits no attention, or (as Lord Barington) to an almost equally precarious mode of *interpretation*, on which no dependance can be placed; as when Beza, Elsn., and Mackn. suppose that the words *ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι* do not mean that the spirits were in prison at the time when Christ preached to them; but that he preached by his spirit to the antediluvians, who *are now* (i. e. in the age of Peter) *in prison*. And Beza and Bens. think that the Apostle proposes this example to their brethren, to deter them from being corrupted by those around them. The latter explains the expression, " the custody of death," or " the state of the dead." Which may *possibly* be the sense; and it is preferable to that assigned by Hamm., Whitby, Wells, &c., who understand it, figuratively, of the being in *bondage to sin*, Is. 42, 7. 49, 9. 61, 1 & 2. But both the foregoing interpretations are liable to many objections, some of which have been well stated by Mr. Slade, who also justly excepts to the interpreting *πνευμ.* *persons*, or *men*. Very harsh and far-fetched is the exposition of Pott, which is detailed by Rosenm., and highly censurable is the remark : " Petrus Christum apud inferos *tunquam κηρύσσοντα sibi fingit*," because, forsooth, it had been the custom of the *wise* so to do, in compliance with the superstition of the vulgar, that great men, after death, pursue the same

plans and purposes as when on earth ; as, for instance, Hercules, Agamemnon, Achilles, &c. This is surely in the worst spirit of the New School ; and the *arrogance* is only equalled by the *folly* of it.

To me no interpretation seems at all natural, or to carry with it the stamp of truth, but the *common* one, namely, that Christ went and preached (or rather, proclaimed his kingdom) to the antediluvians in Hades. And this is supported by the united authority of the antients and the soundest of our modern Commentators. (See Œcumen., Cyril, and Schol. Matth.) Even Rosenm. acknowledges : “ Videtur Petrus docere, Christum etiam post mortem corporis, quoad animum a corpore separatum, et in ἄδην delatum, continuasse negotium docendi et religionem tradendi, in quo peragendo vitam suam in his terris consumserat.” The words certainly involve no difficulty ; and the plain and natural sense is not to be rejected because it contains matter of wonder, or what is little accountable, to us with our present faculties. Man (as Mr. Slade says), on this point, is not an adequate judge ; the subject lies entirely beyond the reach of his knowledge : and we may apply to this case the remarkable words of St. Paul, τὸ μυστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ σωφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ, 1 Cor. 1, 25. He also cites some excellent remarks from Bp. Horsley, Sermon 20., the whole of which deserves attentive perusal. See also Bp. Pearson on the Creed, p. 228. In the words following ἀπειθήσασι ποτε—ὑδάτος there is no difficulty, if for ἅπαζ ἐξεδέχετο we read ἀπεξεδέχετο, with many MSS. of different recensions. The common reading is justly supposed to have been a mere conjecture of Erasmus. Ἀπεκδέχεσθαι denotes long and patient waiting. ἼΙ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία, for ὁ Θεὸς μακροθυμῶν. Eis ἦν is said to be for ἐν ἡ. But it is a frequent phrase. The sense is : “ into which a few (i. e. eight) persons (embarking) were saved through the water.” The διὰ, Rosenm. says, is for ἐν. But we may compare the expression σωθήσεται διὰ πυρὸς at 1 Cor. 3, 15.

21, 22. ὧ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον, &c. “ The antetype to which ark (namely, what corresponds to, and was figured by it, i. e. by the preservation in it of Noah and his family) doth now save us, as the ark did them (I mean), baptism, which, it must be remembered, is not merely the putting away the filth of the flesh (by material water), but the answer of a good conscience towards God. For ὧ some read ὁ, i. e. *the water* : which, in the end, produces the same sense ; but less regularly. Ἐπερωτήμα, Rosenm. observes, signifies, properly, an *interrogation*, and then an *engagement* resulting from it, a *stipulation*, *promise*. “ Now in baptism (continues he) the minister used to put the interrogation : ἀποτάσσει τῷ Σατανᾷ ; To which the candidate answered, ἀποτάσσομαι. Again

he interrogated: συντάσσει τῷ Χριστῷ. Ans.: συντάσσομαι. By συνείδησις is meant what we are "conscious of," our *internal perceptions and feelings*. The ἐπερώτημα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς εἰς Θεὸν will therefore be the ε. σ., &c. Θεῷ ποιηθὲν, the promise made to God that we will live righteously and holily, that we may have a conscience void of offence towards God. This Tertullian calls the *sponsio salutis*. Δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This must be referred to σώζει. The sense is: "Baptism, and sincere profession of religion conjoined with it, preserves us from perdition, and procures us a hope of eternal felicity, because of the resurrection of Jesus Christ; for from thence we also conceive a hope of our own resurrection." (Rosenm.) See the note of Carpzov, and also Whitby, Benson, and Mackn., or the extracts in Slade. With the συνειδ. ἀγαθ. I would compare Herodian 6, 3, 9. τῆς ἀγαθῆς συνείδησεως τὸ θαρράλειον.

The remaining words ὅς ἐστιν—δυνάμεων are sufficiently plain. On δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ see the note on Rom 8, 34. And on ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων see the note on Eph. 1, 21.

CHAP. IV.

This Chapter consists of *two* parts. In the *first* (ver. 1—12.) is contained an exhortation to a holy life. In the *second* St. Peter fortifies the Christians against the persecutions which they were suffering for religion's sake. (Rosenm.) Having told them, ch. 3, 17., &c., that if it was better to suffer for well-doing than for wickedness, and enforced it by the example of Christ, who suffered death for others, but is now exalted to glory, he here returns to the same subject, recommending it to them to imitate Christ in his holiness as well as his sufferings. And, to prevent the bad effects of the reproach which was thrown upon them by their old acquaintance, who continued in idolatry and vice, he puts them in mind

of a righteous judgment to come, when they should be rewarded, and their enemies punished. (Bens.)

VERSE 1, 2. Χριστοῦ οὖν—ὀπλίσασθε. The ἔννοια signifies the feelings, dispositions, &c.; and the sense is: “Arm yourselves with the same feelings for patiently bearing the evils of this life, and the impending persecutions for religion’s sake.” Ὅτι ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ, πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας, “for he who suffers in the flesh usually ceases to sin, and abstains from it.” See Rom. 6, 7. On the benefits of adversity, and especially if borne patiently, in promoting piety (and, as Gray says, “leaving us leisure to be good,)” not only the sacred writers treat, but also the profane ones. And the experience of every age confirms it. See Gray’s beautiful Ode to Adversity.

The words following are closely connected; and the sense, according to the best Critics, is: “so as no longer to live conformably to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.” See Carpzov. and Rosenm. The εἰς τὸ signifies *ita ut, so as*. Ἀνθρωπ. must be taken (as κόσμος often is) to denote *men of the world, ungodly persons*. Βιωσαι θελήματι Θεοῦ is well expressed by Doddr. in his celebrated epigram: “I live to pleasure while I live to thee.” See Rom. 6, 10 & 11.

3. ἀρκετὸς γὰρ—κατεργάσασθαι, “Suffice it for us, for the time *past* of our life, to have practised the things to which the Heathens are prone.” The words following πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείας are added *exegetically*. Ἡμῶν is for ὑμῶν, per κοίνωσιν, and to mitigate the severity of the censure. Κατεργάσασθαι, *practise, perpetrate*; for the term is mostly used in a bad sense. Πορεύεσθαι, like the Heb. *הלך*, denotes habitual action. Ἐπιθυμίαις, *lusts*. Οἰνοφλυγίαις “*beastly drunkenness*,” since οἰνοφλύξ literally denotes one who vomits up wine, like Polyphemus in Homer’s *Odys*. On κώμοις see Rom. 13, 13. Πότοις, i. e. συμποσίοις, *drinking parties*, which, even though not extending to drunkenness, are blameable, as *tending* to it in the end. Ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλοτρείαις, “*abominable idolatries*.” Now since the *Jews* are usually supposed

to have been, in this age, not chargeable with *idolatry*, many Commentators, as Whitby and Dodd., think the Gentile converts only are here addressed. But there is no change in the form of address; and therefore it seems preferable, with Grot., Hamm., Rosenm., and most recent Commentators, to understand it, not of idolatry *itself* (of which Benson rightly asserts that the Jews, as a body, are no where charged either by Christ or the Apostles), but of a *participation* in it (or the *guilt* of it) by imitating some of the customs at the Gentile idol feasts, or sometimes *partaking* of these, or frequenting games in honour of the Heathen gods; or, at least, eating of meats offered to idols; and, in a general way, falling into idolatrous *manners* and heathen morals. Now, from the close connection of the Jews with the Greeks and other Heathens, they had, we know, imbibed many of their opinions, and adopted many practices which partook of idolatry. Of all which Josephus and Philo supply abundant evidence. And of the horrible corruption of *Jews*, as well as *Gentiles*, no one who has read the histories of that age can doubt.

4. ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται—βλασφημοῦντες. Mackn. renders the ἐν ᾧ “on account of your former life.” But this sense seems not well founded. Nor can I approve of the *wherein* of our common version, which occasions a pleonasm. *Preferable* is the sense assigned by Dind., *in respect to which*. But perhaps it is rightly taken by Pott for ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ξενίζονται οἱ, “they wonder at this, namely, that,” &c. The ἐν ᾧ is for ὑφ’ οὗ; as in a passage of Josephus, cited by Kypke. And so Rosenm. Ξενίζονται, “they are amazed, surprised.” A signification found in Joseph., Polyb., Plut., and the Greek Fathers. See Elsn., Wets., Krebs., and Kypke. It is, by Rosenm., derived from the admiration with which guests and strangers view houses, public buildings, &c. for the first time. Συντρεχόντων, “rushing eagerly with them up to the same *sink* of profligacy and corruption;”

for such is, by Wets., Pott, and Rosenm., supposed to be the sense of ἀνάχυσιν, *colluviem*. The term denotes, properly, the act of *out-pouring*; and then, the place of emptying, &c. Τῆς ἀσωτίας. This designates every kind of intemperance and corruption, literally *sottishness*. See Wakef. on Eurip. H. F. 967. And it qualifies the ἀνάχυσιν. Βλασφημ. includes both bitter railing and every kind of mockery. Now it is very natural men of this description should so act; for, to use the words of a writer from whom we should little expect such a reflection (Petron., cited by Wets.), qui vitiorum omnium inimicus rectum iter vitæ cœpit inspicere, primum propter morum differentiam odium habet; quis enim potest probare diversa?

5. οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι ζώντας καὶ νεκρούς, for ἀλλ' ἀποδωσ., Pott says. At τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κ. must be understood ἐαυτὸν. The phrase ἐτοίμως ἔχειν signifies "to be prepared, to be *about* to do;" as Acts 21, 13. 2 Cor. 12, 14. and the best writers. It here does *not* import, as Rosenm. explains, the having full power, but the fully *intending*; and is used to show the absolute certainty of the action. This will not, therefore, prove that the Apostle was in immediate expectation of the judgment.

After all Benson's refinements, the ζώντας must mean τοὺς ἐτιζώντας, those (*then*) alive; as the νεκροὺς, those already dead. So Rosenm.: "tunc victuros, quam veniet, et præmortuos," i. e. omnes omnino homines. Benson interprets the νεκρ. figuratively, i. e. "dead in trespasses and sins." Wets. explains, "those who have died for the Gospel." Mackn. understands by the ζώντας καὶ νεκρούς the Jews and Gentiles.

6. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα—πνεύματι.

The sense of these words is somewhat obscure; and therefore the context is so much the more carefully to be attended to. Now if this be done, I see not how the interpretations of those (as Whitby, Bens., Dodd., &c.), who take νεκ. in a figurative sense, can be tolerated. Yet understanding it in a *physical* one (conformably to the interpretation of the word adopted in the preceding verse), the

perplexing question is, how the Gospel can be said to be preached to the *dead*? This, as Wets. observes, is no where asserted in Scripture. And he might have added, that it is contradictory to the tenour of Scripture. For it is as certain that the Gospel is not preached to the dead, as that the dead do not perform any acts of religion. So Ps. 115, 17. "The dead praise not thee, O Lord, neither all they that go down into silence." To obviate this, some, as Slade, comparing the passage with 3, 19., understand the Apostle to assert that the Gospel had been preached, or proclaimed, *even* to the dead (καὶ νεκροῖς), that they will be judged by the law of nature for the things done in the body, and be rewarded, in proportion to their deserts, by a spiritual life, according to the will and power of God." But this is too harsh to be admitted. Others, as Jensus, Carpz., and Rosenm. would take εὐηγγελίσθη to denote the *announcing of good news*. Whether this sense can be admitted, I would not venture to say: but be that as it may, νεκροὺς must (I think) be interpreted as in the preceding verse; and it involves the *least* difficulty to suppose, with the above mentioned Commentators, as also Wets. and Jaspis, that it is meant of those who, being Christians, have died for the profession of the faith. The general sense is thus expressed by Rosenm.: "Even to those who in these times have suffered death, was brought the glad annunciation, that although they had suffered death in the flesh, yet by the divine omnipotence they shall be made alive."

The *ἵνα* is *eventual*. And κρίνεσθαι σαρκὶ is a *phrasis prægnans*, or two phrases condensed into one, for, "be capitally condemned, and suffer execution in the body." Κατὰ ἀνθρώπους signifies, *as far as concerns, at the hands of men*. The *κατὰ* is used in conformity to the *κατὰ* in κατὰ Θεόν.

7. From the consideration of the awful event just adverted to, the Apostle proceeds to exhort them to the practice of sobriety, and regular constant prayer; enjoining withal mutual love, hospitality, and a right use of their spiritual gifts.

7. πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικε. The expression τέλος πάντων, is thought to involve some difficulty; since, if taken in its natural import, as denoting the end of the world and the final consummation of all things, it will show that Peter was informed as to the period of that awful event. To obviate this, many, as Schoettg. and Mede, interpret it of the destruction of Jerusalem. But (as Doddr. observes) those to whom the Apostle was writing were little concerned with such an event. (See, however, Mackn.) Others, as Cæcumen., explain τέλος, the

issue of the prophecies concerning that event. Which is liable to the same objection: and of πάντων, according to either interpretation, no satisfactory account can be given. Rosenm. would supply ἀνθρώπων, and take the words to express this sentiment, "The life of all men is short." But that is so arbitrary a method, and yields a sense so precarious and, a *prima facie*, improbable, that it cannot be thought of.

Upon the whole, the *first* interpretation seems preferable to either of the two others. (See Grot. and Germ.) But there is no reason why we may not understand the expression (with Doddr. and others, as at James 5, 9. ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικε,) of that *particular* and *personal* consummation of all things, which takes place at the *death* of every one. See Bp. Horsley's Serm. 1, 11 & 111. and the note of Slade.

7. σωφρόνισατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς τὰς προσευχάς, "be sober-minded, and watchful in the exercise of prayer;" literally, be vigilant for the exercise of prayer, and to preserve a sober-mindedness of character. Both necessary to support the life of God in the soul of man. See 1 Thess. 5, 6 & 8. and the note there. The above signification of νήφειν is rare: yet I have noted down the following example. Plut. adv. Stoic. § 19. νήφων πρὸς ἀρετὴν οὐδὲ ἐστι.

8. πρὸ πάντων δὲ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες. Here, as often, the participle is for the finite verb. Πρὸ πάντων, *imprimis*. See the note on James 5, 12. Ἐχειν ἀγάπην seems a popular phrase for παρέχειν, *exercise*. Ἐαυτοὺς is for ἀλλήλους; as often. Ἐκτενῆ, *intensive, fervent*. See the note on 1, 22.

On the interpretation of the words following, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, Commentators differ. Some (and especially the Romanists) explain: "charity shall procure us pardon for a multitude of sins." But (as Doddr. observes) it would be monstrous to imagine, that *acts of liberality* to the poor can procure the *pardon of sin*, while men continue in a course of impenitence and unbelief; for by this the whole Gospel would be subverted.

Rosenm. explains thus : " Amicitia et charitas proximo condonat, quicquid condonari potest. Deinde etiam eos, quos sincerè amamus a peccatis abstrahimus; cui consequens est ut Deus hominis jam emendati priora peccata dissimulat." But this seems scarcely taking a right view. The sense (as required by the context) is plainly this : " For (this) affectionate feeling will cover and cause us to forgive a multitude of offences in others." So Prov. 10, 12., which the Apostle had doubtless in view : " Hatred stirreth up strife, but love covereth sins;" or in the words of the Christian Poet,

" 'Tis gentle, delicate, and kind,
To faults compassionate or blind."

Thus καλύψει will be, as Hardouin says, for *condonat*. See Plut. Vit. Pomp., cited by Valpy from Weston ap. Bowyer. To which I add a yet more apposite passage from Procop. 129, 12. ἐνθυμείσθε ὡς φιλία μὲν αἰτίας πολλὰς καλύπτειν πέφυκεν, ἐχθρὰ δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν μικροτάτων. As to the passage of James 5, 20., to which most Commentators here refer, it is not of the same nature. Though, however, the above must be considered as the only correct interpretation of the words, yet it is not to be denied that the exercise of this virtue will (in the words of Doddr.) " entitle us, by divine mercy, to expect forgiveness for numberless slips and failings. For (as he adds) where acts of charity towards the souls and bodies of men spring from an inward principle of love to God, and faith in Christ, with that humble regard to his atonement and righteousness, which every true Christian will have, it cheerfully encourages our hopes of finding many merciful allowances from God in our final account with him." See the note of Slade. Finally, to use the words of Sherlock, Dis. 6, Vol. 3. (referred to by Weston) Charity is the assistant part of that repentance to which the promises of life are made in the Gospel.

9. φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀνευ γογγυσμῶν. See Rom. 12, 13. Hebr. 13, 2. and notes.

10. ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβε χάρισμα—χάριτος Θεοῦ. Here, as on many other occasions, the antients and most moderns explain χάρισμα of the spiritual and supernatural gifts vouchsafed to many of the primitive Christians. Others, as Grot., Est., Rosenm., and most recent Commentators, take it of any *faculty* or *endowment* of mind. But though that may be *included*, yet the other sense is, I doubt not, principally intended; as appears not only by the context, but by the term itself, which has usually that force; as in 1 Tim. 4, 14. and the three celebrated chapters of 1 Cor. 12, 13 & 14. on those χαρίσματα. See the excellent note of Bens. At the same time, from the words immediately preceding, I cannot but

suspect (though the Commentators do not notice it) that the Apostle also intended those *temporal gifts*, natural or acquired (including those of *fortune*), for which we are equally stewards, and have to administer for the good of others.* And this Œcumen. includes.

11. εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ. "If any one (for instance) has the gift, and feels an impulse to teach and preach, let him speak as (one speaking) the oracles and doctrines of God and Christ (and therefore true), and not mere human notions and inventions." Such, I conceive, is the real and complete sense; and it is supported by the Syr. and other antient Versions. See also Bens., and his remarks on the λόγια. The ὡς is *not* (as Rosenm. supposes) redundant. On λαλεῖ, see the note on 1 Cor. 14, 27.

11. εἴ τις διακονεῖ, &c., "If any one exercise the office of Deacon, let him do it (heartily) as out of the full strength which God supplies." Or, as Benson says, this clause may be filled up in like manner with the former one. Now the Deacon's chief, though not sole, business was to attend to the care of the sick, and the relief and sustenance of the poor; for which reason, the Commentators say, the younger persons were selected, and to which there is an allusion in the ισχύος. But this seems too fanciful. At ἐν πᾶσι we may either understand ἀνθρώποις, with reference to both the orders just mentioned, and all other Christians; or πράγμασι, denoting the *actions* of such persons: or it may relate to *both*.

The doxology which follows is by Ben., Wets., and most recent Commentators, as Slade, Rosenm., and Pott, referred to God the *Father*; as at Gal. 1, 5. Rom. 1, 25. 11, 36. 2 Cor. 11, 31. But as διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ seems here to mean *by the religion of*

* In which view I would compare Eurip. Phœn. 565. Οὔτοι τὰ χρήματ' ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί, τὰ τῶν Θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα· ὅταν δὲ χρήζωσ' ἂν ἀφαιροῦνται πάλιν, and Phocylyd. f. 2, 7. οἰκονόμος τ' ἀγαθὴ.

Jesus Christ, the *Gospel*, whose manifestations have been above adverted to, I cannot but agree with Grot. and Doddr. in understanding it of *Christ*. And Grot. aptly compares a very similar *acclamatio ad Christum* at 1 Tim 4, 18. *Κράτος, empire, dominion*; as the Hebr. *י* is sometimes rendered by the Sept. *δυναστεία*.

12. From hence to ver. 19. the Apostle exhorts them patiently to endure afflictions in the cause of Christianity; especially employing two arguments: 1. That the more the trials are which we have borne on earth, after the example of Christ, the greater will be our reward (ver. 13). 2. That afflictions suffered for conscience sake are no longer to be accounted such (ver. 14. fin.). Now those for whom the Epistle was meant seem to have been exposed to many and fierce persecutions; since to these the Apostle again and again reverts. (Pott.) The arguments are thus stated by Benson. “It was not, the Apostle hints, a strange or unusual thing for the people of God to be persecuted. 2. Though they suffered here, as Christ did, they should hereafter be glorified together with him. 3. Besides the prospect of that future glory, they had, at present, *the spirit of God* for their support and comfort. 4. That it was an honour for any one of them to suffer, not as a malefactor, but as a Christian. 5. Though afflictions began with the Christians, yet the weight of the storm would fall on the unbelievers.

12. *μὴ ξενίσεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν γενομένη.* The construction is thus laid down by Rosenm.: *Μὴ ξενίσεσθε (ἐπὶ) τῇ πυρώσει γενομένη ἐν ὑμῖν πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν, i. e. ὑμῶν.* The literal sense is: “Be not surprised (and therefore troubled) by, or through, fire for trial (i. e. the severe persecution permitted, for your trial) which ye now suffer. The words *ὡς ζένου—συμβαίνοντος*, are exegetical of *ξενίς*. In the *πύρωσις εἰς πειρασμὸν* there is an allusion to the *questio*; a torment by fire. So

Joseph. Val. 4, 469. (Transl. Whist.): "and they made them pass the fiery trial." Polyb. 22, 3, 7. οἱ γὰρ καίροι τὴν καίρον τὴν ἐκ πυρὸς βάσανον πρόσῃγον. See also 33, 9, 3.

13. ἀλλὰ καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε—ἀγαλλιώμενοι. "But rather as ye participate in the sufferings of Christ, rejoice; that at the time when his glory shall be revealed, ye may (indeed) exultingly rejoice." Κοινωνεῖν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασι, signifies (as Rosenm. explains) not only to bear similar sufferings with Christ, but for a similar cause, even that of religion. Pott compares James 1, 2. Hebr. 10, 34. Acts 5, 11. 2 Cor. 1, 7. See also Tanchuma ap. Shoettg. The ἵνα is *eventual*. On the ἀποκαλ. Ἰησοῦ see 1, 7 & 13. In χαρ. ἀγαλλ. there is a sort of Hebraism.

14. εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι—ἀναπαύεται, "If ye suffer reproaches in the cause of Christ, happy are ye: for the spirit of glory and God (or a glorious and godlike spirit) resteth upon you, resideth in, shews itself in you." Ἐν ὀνόματι for ἔνεκα Χριστ., "for the sake, or in the cause of Christ and his religion." On the τὸ τῆς δόξης Θεοῦ, Commentators variously speculate. The above seems to be the best founded interpretation. We have the genitive for the cognate adjective, by Hebraism. As to the reading δυνάμεως, it seems to be a gloss. The ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται alludes to a spirit imparted from the Deity, by which such things are effected, and which, as Pott acknowledges, is that by which Christians were supposed to be enabled both to lead a holy life and to work miracles. It is then added: κατὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφημεῖται, κατὰ δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται, "on their part, as far as regards them, He (i. e. the Spirit, or God) is blasphemed and reviled, but as far as regards you, he is celebrated and praised." "They (paraphrases Rosenm.) reproach your constancy and fortitude as superstitious pertinacity, but you by that very thing evince your reverence to God, who has imparted that spirit."

15, 16. μὴ γὰρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς, ἢ κλέπτῃς, ἢ κακοποιὸς, ἢ ὡς ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος. The γὰρ refers to a clause omitted: "Misunderstand me not; for I speak not of suffering in a *bad* cause. Let no one (I enjoin you)," &c. This is preferable to taking the γὰρ for οὖν, with Rosen.; or in the sense *only*, with the Syr. Πασκ. A forensic term, signifying "suffer what the law adjudges." Κακοποιὸς. A general term, which may be rendered, "or as guilty of any other misdemeanour." The sense of ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος is not so easy to determine. Œcumen. and most moderns explain it, "a *busy body* in other people's affairs." Others, "a *ensorious person*," which may be included in the former. But this is by some thought hardly consistent with the πασχέτω. Hence Schleus. and others interpret it as an Hellenistical phrase to denote an *utterly vicious person*, a man laden with vices. But for this the authority is very weak. The same may be said of the exposition of Pott. and Rosenm., "*one who lays snares for others, a rebel*." But these two last interpretations involve far more difficulty than the common one. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose, that there might then be laws inflicting some actual punishment on those convicted of busily prying into other people's affairs, and, as is almost always the case, exaggerating what may be true, and fabricating falsities, to their great injury. This interpretation, too, is much confirmed by 1 Tim. 5, 13. where St. Paul seems to have had in view this same vice of tittle-tattling and back-biting, in the words περιέργοι, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δεόντα. Thus, I think, it is clear that the words περιέργος and ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος are as nearly as may be of the same sense: the first meaning a busy-body; and the latter a busy-body in others' affairs: which affinity (though it scarcely needs the confirmation of Classical authority) is evident from Philostr. Epist. Apollon. 59. μὴ περιέργος ᾗς, οὐκ ἂν ἐν ᾗς τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις πράγμασι δίκαιος, "if you had not been a busy-body, you would not have been

a judge in other men's affairs." See Eurip. Hip. 785. and Markl. in loc.

16. εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς. Χριστιανὸς occurs only thrice in the New Testament; Acts 11, 36. and the present passage. It appears that *now* the name had become thoroughly established. Ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ, "on this account (as 2 Cor. 3, 10. 9, 3. Col. 2, 16.) namely, that ye have been thought worthy to suffer afflictions for Christ's sake."

17. ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ, "For the time is at hand for judgment, and to commence with the people of God" (i. e. Christians). See Slade. Κρίμα is variously interpreted: but from the context the common interpretation *judgment* may very well be supported. By this is meant (as Rosenm. explains) ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲛⲁ, *Dei constitutio*, de immittendis scil. adversis, namely, for the purpose of purification, trial, and example to others. So Benson says it designates the particular distress that was to take place before Jerusalem should be destroyed. The Christians were to expect to feel some of the first effects of that general calamity. It was *to begin with them*, as our Saviour had plainly prophesied. It was God's way of old to *begin* with sending calamities on his own people." See his references.*

17. εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ; "If we Christians be first afflicted," &c. Τέλος, *end*, i. e. lot. The sense, then, is: "what will become of the wicked?" It is hinted that they will utterly perish. No obscure prediction of the ruin which overwhelmed the Jewish state a few years after.

18. καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρ-

* Schoettg. here aptly adduces from a Rabbinical passage: "Pœnæ nunquam perveniunt in mundum, nisi impii in eo sint. Verùm non incipiunt, nisi a justis primùm." And a little further on: "Quando potentia datur perditori, nullam ille inter justos et impios differentiam observat: neque hoc tantum sed a justis primùm incipit." Compare Jer. 10, 7. Ps. 68, 36. and see Wets.

τῶλός ποῦ φανέται; A happy amplification of the sentiment from Prov. 11, 31. Sept. The sense is: "If the righteous be with difficulty snatched from evils, what shall be the lot of the impious and wicked?" The interrogation involves a strong negation, and implies, (as Rosenm. says) utter perdition. Similar sentiments are adduced from the Rabbinical writers by the Commentators. On σωζ. see Benson and Slade.

19. ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες—ἀγαθοποιῶν, "Wherefore let those who suffer according to the will and permission of God, commit their lives and souls unto him, as unto a faithful and benevolent Creator, continuing in well-doing." The ψυχὰς most Commentators explain *themselves*, by Hebraism. But Benson well defends the common interpretation *souls*. It may mean their *lives*, their souls, and every thing that concerns both. Πιστῶ, *veracious*, true to his promises. So Benson explains it: who may be depended upon, as one of sufficient power, wisdom, and goodness, to make all things conduce to the good of the pious; and particularly to raise them to a happy immortality. This promise he had made to them in the Gospel, and they might trust to him for the performance. Ἀγαθοποιῶν is variously explained: but it must be taken in its most extensive sense, well doing of every kind. See also 1 Pet. 2, 14, and 2, 15.

CHAP. V.

Much depended on the conduct of the Bishops or Pastors of the Church, especially in time of persecution. The Apostle therefore recommends it to *them* to behave in a becoming manner, and take particular care of the flocks committed to them; and to their *people*, to behave well to them; and finally, he expects *all* to behave well mutually to each other. (Benson.)

VER. 1. πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν—κοινωνός. By the

πρεσβ. are meant both the heads of congregations (teachers, ver. 2.) and others employed on the government thereof. The συμ. like the Latin *cum*, imports community in office; as in numerous words. It is observed by Benson and Mackn., that if Peter had been the Prince of the Apostles, he would, in this place, and in the inscriptions to his two Epistles, have assumed the high prerogative; and would not have used the language he here does. Though that may be partly accounted for from condescension and humility.

1. μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, “an eye-witness of the sufferings on the resurrection of Christ from the dead.” All this, Benson has shown, is involved in the sense of the expression. See his long and excellent note, and consult his references. By a *partaker of the glory to be revealed* must be understood, with Whitby and Benson, a partaker then in the *pledge* or *earnest* of the glory yet to be revealed, the first fruits of the Spirit, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. See more in Benson.

2. ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. A common pastoral metaphor, by which leaders of *any* kind (kings, teachers, and priests,) are compared to shepherds. The sense is: “Nourish with sound doctrine, and superintend the morals of those committed to your care.” Μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς, “not as if it were a burthen, or as if ye were constrained.” I suspect that this has reference to some who served the office without stipend, but with indifference and want of zeal. Μὴ αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλὰ προθύμως, “not discharging the office for the sake of the lucre (which would be base), but with good will, *toto corde* (as the Syr.), and only accepting the lucre, to *enable* you to discharge the office.”

3. μὴ δὲ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν. As Θεοῦ is not in the original, Doddr. deserts the Common Version, and renders as if it were an ellipsis of ἐαυτῶν. But though Θεοῦ be not *expressed*, yet it is plainly to be supplied both from the subject and the context;

for at the ποιμνίου just after, it *must* be understood. With respect to the κλήρων, this is variously explained; by Dodwell and Whitby, of the *possessions* of the Church; for which signification there is sufficient authority; but little probability in the *thing itself*; though Slade thinks, that as there were *contributions*, there might be a *fund*. But considering the poverty of the primitive Christians, and other circumstances, that is not likely. Now κατακυριεύουσες κλήρων, in the simple diction of the Apostle, can only apply to *persons*: and the Commentators have well shown how it arose that Christian *congregations* came to be called God's *heritages*. See Grot., Bens., Rosenm., and Dodd., or Slade.

3. τύποι, *exemplars*, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains): "do yourselves what you enjoin on others," contrary to the custom of the Scribes and Pharisees. Matt. 23, 3 and 4.

4. καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποιμένου, κομιεῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον. Φανερ., "shall appear; as Col. 3, 4. Ἀρχιπ. Called at Hebr. 13. τὸν μέγαν ποιμένα. On κομιζ. see 1, 9. With the ὁ τῆς δόξης στεφανὸς (*a glorious crown*,) Rosenm. compares Sir. 43, 11. κάλλος οὐρανοῦ δόξα ἄστρων. There is an agonistical metaphor, which may be illustrated from Eurip. Hipp. 73. πλεκτὸν στεφανὸν ἐξ ἀκηράτου λειμῶνος. Soph. Aj. 465. στέφανον εὐκλείας. Eurip. Suppl. 315. στέφανον εὐκλείας λαβεῖν and Antiop. frag. 4. See also Biset on Aristoph. Lysist. 875 f. The whole image is an expressive designation of *perpetuity*. See Benson.

5. ὁμοίως νεώτεροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις, "In like manner ye people, submit yourselves to your teachers." Such is the sense assigned by the best Commentators, and which seems required by the context, not "*younger persons*, submit yourselves to the elder." Rosenm. compares Luke 22, 2. where ὁ μείζων and ὁ νεώτερος are similarly opposed. I would here adduce a fine sentiment of Aristid. 1, 431 c.

εἰδóτας ἐστίν οὖδ, καὶ ἦτταν νίκης εὐσχημονεστέραν οὖσαν καὶ πλείονος ἄξιαν.

5. πάντες δὲ, ἀλλήλοις ὑποτασσόμενοι, τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε. Ἐγκομβοῦσθαι is derived from κόμβος, which signifies primarily a *knot*, *top-knot*, *topping*, (and hence our *comb*; as a cock's *comb*): 2dly, what we call a *bow-knot* or button, and other ornamental fastening by which vestments are drawn about any one; and 3dly, the *vestment* itself. It is observed by Fischer de Vit. Lex. p. 18. and Schleus., that ἐγκώμβωμα denotes a short *jerkin* (or rather, I should suppose, something like our *moveable capes*), put over the other garments, and fastened by knots and bands to the collar. Hence ἐγκομβοῦσθαι came to mean, in a general way, *to be clothed*: and as all sorts of clothing are, in the antient languages, applied to denote *moral habits*, especially of virtue; so here the Apostle means, that they should *put on* humility as an ornament, and wear it as a *habit*. And this seems to be all that it is necessary to be kept in view; for to enter into all the *argutiæ* of the Commentators (on which see Pole's Syn. and Wolf) were to little purpose. Schleus. compares 2 Macc. 7, 5. ἀγριωτέραν ἐμπεπορημένοι ὡμότητα. To which I add Ælian V. H. p. 10. ἡμπείχετὸ δὲ σωφροσύνη, and Hom. Il. a. 149. ἀναιδείην ἐπιεμένε, where Heynè remarks: "Dicitur aliquis indutus, h. e. instructus, esse iis quæ ipsi propria sunt et solennia."

6. ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. Christians are here exhorted to wholly submit themselves to the governance of the Lord. "Now (observes Rosenm.) *they* submit themselves to God, who acknowledge, and habitually feel, their total dependence on him to whom they owe every thing, who acquiesce in his will, and bear patiently the evils of this life, who do not perversely resist his Providence, and who finally expect every thing good from the power of God." Κρατ. χεῖρα, like the Hebr. קַרְיָהּ in Exod. 3, 9., signifies *mighty power*. Ἐν

καιρῷ, “at his own time, at the proper season.” In some MSS. is added ἐπισκοπῆς. But that was evidently foisted in from 2, 12.

7. πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρρίψαντες ἐπ’ αὐτὸν. A further designation of this submission. Ἐπιρρίψαι, I conceive, is here a vox prægnans, for ἀπορρίψ. and ἐπιρρίψ., i. e. “casting off all anxious cares and solitudes, and reposing them on God and his Providence.” This is taken from Ps. 55, 23. Compare Matt. 6, 25 and 30. Αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν, “for with him rests the care of you, and your concerns.” Pott refers to Matt. 22, 16. Mark 12, 14. Joh. 10, 13. 12, 6., and compares Matt. 4, 25 and 30. 6, 25. and also M. Anton. 4, 31. τὸ δὲ ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ βίου διεξέλθε, ὡς Θεοῖς μὲν ἐπιτετρόφως τὰ σεαυτοῦ πάντα ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς. To which I add Soph. Electr. 173. where there is the following fine sentiment; θάρσει μοι, θάρσει, τέκνον· ἔστι μέγας οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ὃς ἐπορᾷ πάντα καὶ κρατύνει· ᾧ τὸν ὑπεραλγῇ χόλον νέμουσα, κ. τ. λ. and Eurip. Phœn. 717. ἀλλ’ εἰς Θεοῦς χρη̑ ταῦτ’ ἀναρτήσαντ’ ἔχειν.

8—11. In this final admonition Christians are exhorted to constancy in their profession, in spite of the evils with which they were encircled. (Pott.)

8. ὁ ἀντιδίκος ὑμῶν διάβολος. As διάβολος has no article, many recent Commentators render it a *malicious accuser*. But the words ἀντιδ. and διάβ. are to be closely connected; and I entirely agree with Bp. Middleton, that the sense is, “your opposing evil spirit,” i. e. the evil spirit who is your opposer. There is supposed to be an allusion to Job. 1, 7. where Satan is similarly designated. Ἀντιδίκος has the general sense of ἔχθρος; as Matt. 12, 39. Ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος, “as a lion roaring and raging for food, and ready for his prey.” Our *roar* is doubtless from ὦρ. It is well observed by Dodd., that it was natural St. Peter should give such a caution, since he, through inattention to his master’s warning, had yielded to a similar temptation. Rosenm. (after Benson) remarks, that there is here ascribed to the

Devil what he does by his instruments, the infuriate persecutors, Jews and Heathens ; and that diabolical *temptation in general* cannot be the subject, but those *tribulations* which might sway their minds to desert their Christian profession, and the necessity for the exercise of fortitude and constancy ; as appears from ver. 9. But, though such acted as the subordinate agents of Satan, yet that will not exclude, but rather suppose (as the words of the Apostle require) the operation of their head and master ; though as to the *mode* of operation we are (as in a thousand other matters of *undoubted fact*) left in the dark. Nay, it is difficult to imagine how, with our present faculties, more light could have been *received*.

9. ὧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ π. resist, and that unto the last ; never capitulate. So we are told to resist the Devil, James 4, 7. Compare also Eph. 6, 13. and see Benson. At στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει Pott and others strangely stumble, and pervert the plain sense, which is : “continuing steadfast in faith.” Now this was the most effectual mode of resisting him ; since his temptations were directed to induce them to renounce their Christian profession.

9. εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελείσθαι. The τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων is for τὰ αὐτὰ παθήματα. Ἐπιτελ. is explained by the recent Commentators *happen*. And this they support from Xen. Mem. 4, 8, 8. But that is a very feeble sense. Bens. renders, “carried to a great length.” But for that sense (which is somewhat harsh) I know of no authority. It should rather seem that the term is used for ἐνεργεῖσθαι, *effected*. And may there not be some allusion to the prediction of our Lord concerning these παθήματα ? The argument is this : “your case is not singular : the same persecutions are carried on in your Christian brethren throughout the whole world.” Ἀδελφ. is a noun collective, signifying *brotherhood* : there is also a subaudition of οὐσῃ. Pott compares the well

known “Solamen miseris socios habuisse malorum,” and Cic. ad Fam. 6, 2.

10. ὁδὲ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος—θεμελιώσαι. The πάσης is *not* (as Pott supposes) put for μεγίστης, but (as being the genitive of the efficient cause) the sense is: “The God who is the author of blessings of every kind;” as 2 Cor. 13, 14, &c. Ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς—Ἰησοῦ, “who hath by Christ and his Gospel called and invited you to seek eternal salvation.” Δόξαν, i. e. happiness of the most glorious kind. Ὀλίγον, i. e. for this brief period of our earthly sojourn. Καταργεῖσαι, “may he perfect you more and more in the knowledge and practice of religion.” Στηρίζαι, “confirm you in the practice of what you know.” Σθενάσαι, “strengthen you to the performance.” Θεμελιώσαι, “settle, immoveably ground you.” These four terms are unwarrantably taken by Pott as *synonymous*, and accumulated for greater effect. It would have been truer if he had said that all these particulars are *included*, as contributing to *fit* them for the state of eternal glory just mentioned. On the doxology at αὐτῷ—ἀμήν. see the note on 4, 11.

12. διὰ Σιλουανοῦ—ἔγραψα, “thus frigidly have I written by Silvanus (to you, I apprehend, a faithful brother), exhorting, and bearing strong testimony that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand.” On Silvanus see 1 Thess., 1, 1. At ὀλίγων there is the common ellipsis of ῥημάτων. The clause ὡς λογίζομαι, like many similar expressions both in the antient and modern languages, implies, not *doubt*, but *firm persuasion*; as Rom. 8, 18. So that there is no reason, with Grot., to resort to the sense *si bene memini*, which is founded, as Rosenm. shows, on a baseless hypothesis. Ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε, “that the religion in which you are (I trust) firmly fixed, is the true one (and not Judaism, your former faith).”

13. συνεκλεκτῇ, Wall, Mill, and others, suppose to be a Christian woman, the wife of Peter, some think. Others, subaud ἐκκλησίᾳ (which is supported by the

Syr., Arab., Vulg., and Œcumen), i. e. “chosen by God in conjunction with us.” And I agree with Wolf in preferring this, or *διασποράν*.

On the *βαβυλῶνι* there has been no little diversity of opinion. Some, as Mill, Bertram, Pearson, Wolf, Wall, and Fabric., take to denote *Babylon in Egypt*. But this has no probability, and has been refuted by Lardner, who, with the antients, and many eminent moderns, as Grot., Hamm., Whitby, and most of the *Romanists*, think that by *Babylon* is, figuratively, meant *Rome*: and this is supported by the united voice of antiquity; and, therefore, the opinion merits great attention. Certain it is there are many points of resemblance between that Queen of cities, and what we conceive of antient Babylon. Hence the name has been applied to *London*, *Paris*, &c. Were it not for this authority of antiquity on a point where antiquity may be depended on, I should have been inclined to adopt the opinion of *Erasm.*, *Germ.*, *Beza*, *Gomar*, *Lightf.*, *Scaliger*, *Salmas.*, *Cler.*, *L'Enfant*, *Cumberland*, *Wets.*, *Schleus.*, *Rosenm.*, *Bens.*, &c., that it signifies *Babylon in Assyria*. But those Commentators are not agreed whether to understand *Selucia*, i. e. *New Babylon*, which (as *Rosenm.* observes) was the metropolis of the eastern dispersion of the Jews, and whither it was likely *St. Peter*, on leaving *Jerusalem*, would repair; or *Old Babylon*, which, there is reason to think, was not yet totally deserted. The latter opinion is adopted by *Rosenm.*, and it seems preferable; for there is no satisfactory proof that *Seleucia* (though it stepped into the place of *Old Babylon*, and was chiefly built from its ruins) ever received the name of *Babylon*; though, I find, it seems to be so called in some passages of *Lucian*, adduced by me in a *Dissertation on the Antiquities of antient Babylon*, which I shall take an early opportunity of laying before the public, in conjunction with others on antient *Carthage*, antient *Thebes*, the *Pyramids*, the *Labyrinth*, and other interesting monuments of the remotest antiquity.

13. καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. Whether *υἱὸς* is to be understood in the *physical* or the *figurative* sense, Commentators are not agreed. The former interpretation is supported by some antients (see *Œcumen.*), and, of the moderns, *Heuman* and others. It is, however, a question which admits of no certain determination: and the verdict of a critical jury would probably be, “*Non liquet*.” See *Bens.* and *Mackn.*, or *Slade*. I should, for my own part, prefer the latter interpretation, and, with many eminent moderns, as *Rosenm.*, &c., regard this *Mark* as the same with the author of the Gospel.

14. ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλοις ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. An oriental custom of the highest antiquity, on which I

have before treated. Now this *kiss* was called indifferently the *kiss of peace*, or the *holy kiss*, as being used after prayer; as we find from Origen (cited by Rosenm.). Hence some MSS. read ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. But the ἐν is doubtless from the margin. On the εἰρήνῃ ὑμῶν πᾶσι I have before treated. Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, scil. οὖσι, a periphrasis for *Christians*.

SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

SOON after the writing of this Epistle St. Peter was crucified at Rome, and, as we are told, with his head *downward*,—a mixture of cruelty and contumely such as was not unfrequently exhibited. Thus Joseph. 1297, 30., προσήλουν δ' οἱ στρατιῶται τοὺς ἀλόντας, ἄλλον ἄλλῳ πρὸς χλεύην.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1—4. Here we have the *Introduction* to the Epistle, in which, after asserting his Apostolick character, and addressing the Epistle to the *Gentile* converts, St. Peter salutes them, and reminds them that their Christian privileges were owing to the favour of God in Christ, and in consequence of the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit. (Bens.)

1. Συμεών. Some read Σιμών. But it matters not; since the one is the Hebrew (found in Acts 15, 14.), and the other the Hellenistick form. On the clause Συμεών—Χριστοῦ, see the sensible remarks of Mr. Slade. Ἰσότημος is compared by Rosenm. with ἰσομοιρὸς, and other Classical forms. And he notices the elegant use of λαγχάνειν in the sense *receive*. Slade thinks it contains an allusion to the Jewish inheritances, which were obtained by lot. And he refers to 1 Pet., 5, 3. Δικαιοσύνη. A *general* for the *special* term χάριτι, or the like. And so the Hebr. קָרַב. Τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος I. X. Notwithstanding the opinion of Wets. and many dis-

tinguished Scholars, I must still think that this should be rendered, “our God and Saviour Jesus Christ:” the article not being repeated before σωτήρος, because there is no change of person. See the able note of Bp. Middlet. in loc., or the extracts in Slade and Valpy.

2. χάρις ὑμῖν—Θεοῦ. An earnest wish and prayer for every blessing upon them which can result from a right knowledge of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Ἐν, 2, by.

3. ὥς πάντα ἡμῖν—δεδορημένης, “Forasmuch as God has, of his favour, given us all things which pertain to life (i. e. happiness) and godliness.” Some recent Commentators regard the ὥς as pleonastic, adducing numerous examples. And this, as far as concerns *Genitives of consequence*, may apply: but when, as in a Latin or English version, the *verb* is used, the sense will be *because*, or *forasmuch as*. The construction of the sentence is thus laid down by Pott: ὥς τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσεβείαν ἡμῖν δεδορημένης, διὰ—ἀρετῆς (δι’ ὧν—φθορας) καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, &c. The participle δεδορημένης may be taken (as it is by some) in the *passive* sense; but that will still more embarrass the construction, and there is no reason why we should not take it in an *active* sense; for, as Rosenm. observes, in verbs which want the Perfect, or any other tense of the Middle voice, the Passive is used in its place; of which Loesn. adduces numerous examples (in *this very verb*) from Philo. It is remarked by Rosenm., that in ver. 3 & 4, there is the antecedent; and in ver. 3, the consequent is διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως—ἀρετῆς, “by the knowledge of him who hath, of his glorious benignity, invited us thereto.” And he adds: “Hac ratione omnibus præsidii recte agendi nos instruxit.” In διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς there is a common hendiadis: and on the sense here of ἀρετῇ, see the note on 1 Pet., 2, 9. Whitby, however, understands the words of the *glorious effusion of the Holy Spirit*; and Doddr. of that strengthen-

ing energy which God exerts on the human mind, which appeared in so extraordinary a manner in the Apostolic age.

4. δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα ἡμῶν καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρήται, "by which things." This relates either to πάντα, the more remote, or to δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, the nearer antecedent. Μέγιστα καὶ τίμια. An Hendiadis for *exceedingly precious*, namely, as pertaining to eternal felicity. On these promises Benson copiously treats. But, after all that he urges, I cannot abandon the common opinion, that by these are meant the *Gospel promises in general*, such as pardon of sins to the penitent, a glorious resurrection, and eternal life,—the most powerful motives to holiness, and to aim at the becoming partakers of the Divine nature.

4. ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, "that (excited by these promises) you might become partakers of the Divine nature." The φύσις is by some taken pleonastically. And they render the κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως "participants of God," i. e. of his benefits. And this is harsh and forced, and at variance with the context. The best Commentators are agreed that φύσις here denotes *disposition*. Thus to be κοινωνοὶ τῆς φύσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, will be, to imitate God's perfections, aim at a similitude to his moral properties and attributes. And this similarity, the Apostle proceeds to teach them, is to be aimed at by renouncing evil lusts and carnal appetites. That such will form us to a resemblance to God, we find from 1 Joh. 3, 7., 1 Pet. 1, 13.* Φθόρα here, and

* So Rosenm., who further argues from the substance of ver. 3 and 4., that the Apostle could mean no other conjunction than that of *similitude* and *imitation*. See an able discussion of the sense of this phrase in Bens., who, after offering six different interpretations, acquiesces in the above detailed one. He concludes by observing, that the affections, passions, appetites, and inclinations, "implanted in us by God our maker, and the things that are pleasant or useful without us, are none of them in themselves sinful. They are, indeed, temptations, and often, by the abuse of them, lead men into sin. But sin consists merely in the abuse or corruption of them, that is, using them in a wrong kind, manner, or degree. Mankind too generally fall in with the temptations."

at 2, 12 & 19., signifies *corrupt morals*. By the *world* is meant, as usual, that part of it which not only in that corrupt, but in every succeeding age, may be said to be slaves of corruption and vanity. See more in Pott and Rosenm.

5—7. Having reminded them that God had given them all things pertaining to a godly life, our Apostle here mentions those virtues which were required of them: withal intimating that, if professed Christians did not bring forth such fruit, they neither duly attended to the nature of Christianity, nor would they have any benefit thereby. (Bens.)

5. καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπουδῇ πᾶσαν, παρεῖς. “Wherefore using the utmost diligence.” The best Commentators are agreed that this verse is connected with ver. 3, and that the καὶ is to be taken, as often, *pro consecutivo*. See Pott, Bens., and Rosenm. At αὐτὸ τοῦτο Rosenm. subauds διὰ. But κατὰ, which is supplied by Homb., Schoettg., and Wolf, is the milder ellipsis. As to the various readings here found, they merely arose from the difficulty, and are purely *emendations*.

Σπ. παρεισφέρειν, Rosenm. remarks, is here (as in the best writers) used for σπουδάζειν; of which Wets. adduces examples from Joseph. Ant. 20, 9, 12., and also from Diod. and Liban. I cannot but think, with the early moderns (as Beza, Erasm., and Pisc.) that the παρὰ refers to the union of our diligence in co-operation with the grace of God.” See Phil. 2, 12 and 13. And, even in the Classical use, *co-operation* is (I suspect) always implied. There is the same allusion in ἐπιχορηγήσατε; though it is simply rendered *exhibere*.

On the exact sense of ἐν throughout this *glorious chain* the Commentators are not agreed. The recent ones takes it for σὺν; others, for εἰς, *unto*; which, considering the nature of the participles παρεῖς. and ἐπιχορ., seems to be preferable.*

* Slade thinks it may be a *sign of the dative*. But that is only silencing a word which we cannot explain. There is more justice in his remark, that ἐπιχορήγατε ἐν τῇ πίστει may be the same as χο-

The ἀρετή most modern Commentators, from Hamm. to Pott. and Rosenm., considering that several particulars *included* in the general sense of the term are just after added, take in the more special sense *courage*, like the Latin *virtus*. But this signification is unexampled in the *Scriptures*: and the Apostle elsewhere shows too little attention to logical regularity to allow us to lay much stress on the argument adduced. Therefore, though this interpretation is ably supported by Hamm., Doddr., Bens., Wall, Mackn., and Rosenm., I cannot consent to abandon the common one, *Christian virtue*, which is retained, and well illustrated by Schleus. Lex.

Γνωσιν. This is by many Commentators, in conformity with the interpretation of ἀρετή just mentioned, explained *prudence, wisdom, discretion*, so as not to unnecessarily expose themselves to danger. But that is a very uncommon sense of γνώσις; and *religious knowledge* must surely here be understood. And so it is explained by most Commentators. See Mackn. and Jortin ap. D'Oyley.

Ἐγκρατείας. The virtues now enumerated are given as *examples* of what is meant by the general term ἀρετή: and they are classed *first* under the head *personal* virtues; 2. those that have *God* for their object; and 3. those that relate to *man*. Now the *personal* virtues are ἐγκρατεία, temperance in the use of pleasure, and, if need be, *abstinence* from it, and ὑπόμονη, patient endurance, or the right government of ourselves in adversity. Ἐνσέβεια. This is well explained by Mr. Slade a godly temper and behaviour, such a *spirit of godliness* as shows itself in our intercourse with the world. Yet we must not exclude that expression of godliness as shows itself in all the external acts of worship and reverence to the Supreme Being. Φιλαδελφία, i. e. love to Christians. Ἀγάπη. This signifies love in general to others, considered not merely as *Christians*, but as *men*.

On these separate terms I shall not further enlarge; that falling rather under the province of the general Theologian, or Preacher, to whom I must refer the reader in the many excellent Sermons on this interesting portion of Scripture from the pens of our best English Divines.

8. ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα—ἐπίγνωσιν, “For if these virtues reside in, abound in, and be on the increase in you, they will shew you as persons not barren, or unfruitful, in respect to the knowledge of the religion of Jesus Christ,” i. e. persons whose knowledge of the religion is not barren and unfruitful of good works (as the calumnious Heathens pretend). Such seems to be the complete sense; and thus the

ρηγήσατε ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. But it is not quite the same. The ἐπὶ and ἐν may be expressed by our compound preposition *unto*: whereas χορηγ. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει can only mean “supply to your faith;” but *unto* signifies *in addition to* and *besides*.

words require no laboured explanation. See, however, Benson and Pott.

9. ὃ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα—ἀμαρτιῶν, “For he who is destitute of these virtues is but blind and dull of perception, forgetful of the purification of his former sins.” Μυωπάζειν signifies to *wink*, or half shut the eyes, as those do who, being short-sighted, endeavour to discern a distant object. The sense is: “He who is destitute of the moral virtues, and yet expects salvation of the Gospel, which imperatively enjoins them, is blind, or sees a very little way into the true nature of it, and forgets that he was cleansed from his former sins only on *condition* of renouncing sin in future.” Now to forget this were the greatest blindness, such a setting light on the benefits of baptism, as implies a contempt of the religion. Here I would compare a passage of Plato, Ep. 7. τυφλὸς ὢν καὶ οὐχ ὁρῶν οἷς ἀνέπεται τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνοσιουργίαι.

Λήθην λαμβάνειν signifies to *forget*, like many other phrases formed of λαμβάνειν and a substantive.

On the καθαρ. τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν it is observed by Bens., that the Scriptures often and plainly speak of a twofold justification, sanctification, and salvation. The one initial; the other final. When a wicked Jew or Heathen took on him the profession of the Christian religion by baptism, he was justified, *purified*, or saved, *from his old sins*, upon that profession of faith in Christ. Acts 15, 9. 16, 31. 22, 16. Romans 16, 4. 1 Corinthians 6, 11. 2 Cor. 7, 1. Ephesians 5, 26. Tit. 2, 14. Heb. 10, 22 and 23. 1 Pet. 3, 21. 2 Pet. 2, 20, &c. But the final justification, sanctification, or salvation, is not to be attained without Christian good works, or an holy life, after baptism. *Faith* alone was sufficient for the former, but not for the latter. Jer. 17, 7 and 8. Ezek. 18, 21, &c. Matt. 18, 35 Rom. 2, 6. &c. 1 Joh. 1, 7. It is truly remarked by Slade, that this text powerfully corroborates two important doctrines, 1. that the rite of baptism, duly administered, purifies from sin; 2. that men may fall from a state of purification and grace.

10, 11. διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, “Wherefore the rather give diligence to this, only (by the practice of these good works) to make our calling and election sure, firm, stable, and efficacious.” The κλήσις καὶ ἐκλογὴ is explained by Rosenm., the greatest benefit

by which God, of his providence, hath brought us to the Christian religion, and promised us eternal life, if we perform our part. I have more than once illustrated the sense of the words, on Rom. 11, 5. and elsewhere. In refutation of an erroneous exposition of Mackn., it is remarked by Mr. Slade, that their calling to eternal life was *conditional*; and thus there seems no impropriety in the converts being enjoined to make that calling sure and effectual. They were, at that time, in a state of election; but it was a state from which they might fall; they were elect only so long as they were careful to maintain faith and good works.

Βέβαιον γίνεσθαι Rosenm. explains *ratum fieri*. Now these divine promises (says he) we ratify by faith, and the practice of good works. The διὰ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων added in some MSS. and Versions, seems to be a mere scholium.

10. ταῦτα γὰρ ποιῶντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε, “If ye do this, ye shall never fail, or your hope of salvation be frustrated.” Such is, doubtless, the sense; and it is strange that Carpz., and seemingly Rosenm., should render the οὐ μὴ πταίσητε ποτε, “ye will never sin in future,” i. e. ye will be careful lest ye forfeit eternal felicity by sin. This is harsh.

11. οὕτω γὰρ πλουσίως—Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, “For thus will, most mercifully, be granted you an entrance to,” &c. Πλουσίως, “of abundant goodness; as Eph. 2, 4. and elsewhere. To the Classical examples of Schleus. I add Herod. 2, 44. ἰδὼν (ἰρὼν) πλουσίως κατεσκευασμένον. And in Livy we have *opulenter* for *abundè*. Ἐπιχορήγηθήσεται, *grant*; as 2 Cor. 9, 10.

12. διὸ οὐκ ἀμελήσω—αληθεία, “Wherefore (as the thing is so momentous) on this sense.” See Slade in loc. “I shall never cease,” &c. From ver. 18. to 3, 13. the Apostle exhorts them not to suffer themselves to be deceived by false teachers; premising a brief mention, ver. 11—15. of the causes by which he thought proper to again and again urge them to

hold fast that part of pure doctrine which was by the false teachers, not only corrupted, but even derided.

The *καίπερ εἰδότας* may apply, if not to all, yet to the greater part of those whom he is addressing. (Rosenm.) I would compare Appian Pun. 58. *εἰδότας ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσω*. The *ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ* may be an hypallage, signifying, "though ye are at present established in the truth." By Rosenm. it is considered as a brief expression for "are established in the truth which ye have hitherto professed." But this seems incongruous.

13, 14. *δικαίον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι—ὑπομνήσει*, "I think it right, while I am in this earthly tabernacle, to (thus) stir you up by admonition." *Δίκαιον*, *right*, *meet*. A popular use. On *σκηνώμ.* see 2 Cor. 5. 1. For this word in the sense *corpus humanum* no Classical authority has (I believe) been yet adduced. It occurs, however, in Eurip. Heracl. 690. *σμικρὸν τὸ σὸν σκήνωμα*, where see Barnes.

14. *εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχυνὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου*. These words are rightly regarded by Carpz. as parenthetical. "Knowing that speedy will be my laying aside of my tabernacle." Ἀποτιθ., Rosenm. observes, is properly used of putting off *clothes*; but is applied, *per similitudinem*, to striking a *tent*; a term here, as often, used to denote the *body*. Hence those out of the body are at 2 Cor. 5, 3. styled *γυμνοί*.

In the words *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέ μοι*, the Apostle alludes to his martyrdom, which took place, it seems, the next year. He plainly adverts to the words of our Lord recorded at Joh. 21, 18 and 19. But whether *καθὼς* will admit of the sense *in the manner which*, as Benson renders it, I doubt. It is plain that Christ foretold to Peter his *martyrdom*, as he also did to *Paul*. (See 2 Tim. 4, 6.) But the question is, whether these words of the Apostle were founded on any fresh revelation as to the *speedy* approach of that event? This the ancients say *was the case*. But the point admits of no

certain determination. See the conjectures of Bens. It seems highly *probable* that he had ; but it is *possible* that he had *not*, and the words, it is evident, may be explained upon another supposition.

15. σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ—ποιεῖσθαι. The δὲ is *resumptive*: “I will (I say) strive, that after my departure, you may ever have to be mindful of these things.” Ἐχειν is here used for δύνασθαι ; as often.

16. οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις—παρουσίαν. On the connection of this verse with the preceding see Bens. and Pott. It is briefly remarked by Rosenm.: “Here are laid down the *reasons* why the doctrine delivered by the Apostle is true.” Σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις, fables craftily devised, and artfully dressed up, like the sophisms of the Philosophers. Numerous Classical citations are adduced by Wets., but not quite apposite. The following will, I think, be found so. Diod. Sic. 2, 133. ult. μύθους ἡγοῦνται πεπλασμένους τὰς περὶ τῶν Ἀμαζόνιδων ἀρχαιολογίας, and 2, 504, 24. where it is said that men in prosperity are accustomed καταφρονεῖν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς μυθῶν πεπλασμένων, where Wesseling replaces the old reading τοῦ Θεοῦ. I conjecture τῶν Θεῶν.

The δύναμις καὶ παρουσία Rosenm. takes as an *endiadis* for δυνάτη παρουσία ; which, he thinks, the words following require. The sense (he adds) is: “Jesus Christ lived on this earth, and in many wonderful ways proved that he was the Son of God ; and this we do not press on your belief, by the use of such fictitious stories and fables as the Gentile legislators had recourse to, or other crafty persons.” The δυν. καὶ παρ. advert to the second advent of Christ in majesty, to take vengeance on those that know not God, and obey not the Gospel. See the note on 2, 1. The ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος refers to the transfiguration, more plainly adverted to in what follows. Ἐπόπται is a term derived from the Classical writers, where it is used to denote one admitted to view the mysteries. So that it need not be considered, with Mr. Slade, as merely

synonymous with *αὐτόπται*; but only the two forms may be *compared*. See the notes of Elsn., Bens., and Mack., or the extracts in Slade.

17. λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν. Here again we have the participle for the verb. "For he received honour and glory from God the Father;" namely, at his transfiguration. See Matt. 17, 5. Φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ—δόξης, "such a voice from the exalted glory (i. e. from the glorious Jehovah) being uttered over him, saying, This is," &c. On which see the note on Matt. 17, 5. seqq. At αὐτῷ must be understood ἐπὶ. Rosenm. compares Ps. 145, 3. μεγαλοπρέπειν τῆς δόξης.

On ver. 18. see on Matt. 17, 5. and Mark 9, 2.

19. καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον. It is debated what is the sense of τὸν προφητικόν; and whether the comparative in βεβαιότερον has any force or not. The latter will partly depend on the former, which some interpret of the *gift of prophecy* in the *Christian Church*. But the antients, and the most judicious moderns (rightly) maintain that it refers to the whole body of the prophetic predictions concerning the Messiah in the O. T. (See Bp. Horsley's 15th Sermon, or an extract from it in Slade; and also Grot., Bens., and Wolf.) And this is ably supported by Knapp Script. var. argum. p. 1. seqq. If such be the true sense, the *comparative* must have its usual force. Thus Rosenm. explains: "The prophecies had always a great authority with us; but now they have a far greater; since we see events so aptly corresponding to the predictions." So Wets.: "Sermo Propheticus nunc firmior est, postquam eventu comprobatus ^{iam}, ^{et} ante eventum." And so (he adds) the Greek Comment. ^{in loc.} Rosenm. in loc., or the extract from him in Rosenm.

19. ὧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, "to which ye will do well to attend." So Joseph. 11, 6, 12. (cited by Rosenm.) οἷς (γράμμασι Ἀράνου) ποιήσετε καλῶς μὴ προσέχοντες. "To attend to prophecies (explains Rosenm.) is, to investigate and reflect upon their

sense and fulfilment." It must, however, also imply a prompt faith in the word of God. Ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνονται ἐν ἀύχμηρῷ τόπῳ. Φαίνονται is to be taken as the participle *imperfect*; for that is required by the past tenses of the verbs following. Λύχνῳ, a *lantern* or *watch-light* (as opposed to the sun), which shows objects but dimly, as the prophecies pointed the way of salvation. Ἀύχμηρῷ τόπῳ, "a dim and dark place." Αὐχ. signifies, properly, *dirty, squalid*; an idea which, as regards *places*, we continually connect with that of *darkness*. And hence the term comes to have that sense. So Hesych.: ἀύχμηρόν σκοτώδες. And so, in Mich. 4, 8., the Sept. have ἀύχμώδης; Aquila, σκοτώδης; and the Vulg. *nebulosus*. Εἰς οὗ ἡμέρα—καρδίαις ὑμῶν, "until the day or time (of clearer knowledge) arise, and the dog-star arise in your hearts." This sentence (and, indeed, the whole of this beautiful passage) is strangely misunderstood by several eminent Interpreters. No one has better explained the sense than Rosenm., as follows: "On the arrival of the sun, whose messenger is the morning-star, the resplendent day dispels all the darkness, and obscures that candle. So also the doctrine of Christ dispels the darkness of ignorance, and, in respect to clearness, far surpasses the doctrine of the Prophets. On an attentive comparison this difference will be very apparent, and the mind will be illumined with divine light. For it will be evident, that the predictions of the Prophets were dictated by the Holy Spirit, since the events so admirably correspond to the sayings." See also Mr. Slade's note.

20. τοῦτο πρῶτον ἀπόκρυφον καὶ ἰδίαν ἐπίλυσιν. This is a *secret*, and therefore variously interpreted. The difficulty hinges on the rare word ἐπίλυσιν. Many eminent Commentators (as Hamm., Whitby, Benson, Doddr., Mackn., &c.), understand the ἰδίας ἐπίλύσεως of *private invention* or *suggestion*, which, indeed, yields a good sense, but is not fairly deducible from the words; insomuch that some, by

whom this interpretation has been adopted, have resorted to *emendation*, conjecturing ἐπελεύσεως or ἐπηλύσεως, which would yield the required sense; but for neither of these is there any authority. Greatly preferable to this is the common rendering, “of *private explanation* or *interpretation*.”* A frequent sense of ἐπίλυσις. And so ἐπιλύω, in the sense *explain*, occurs elsewhere in Scripture. This interpretation, too, is adopted by some eminent Critics, and recently by Schleus. Bp. Horsley (who has four Sermons on this text) explains (nearly in the same way), “no prophecy is of self-interpretation.” See the Sermons themselves, or an extract in Slade. Carpz. explains προφητεία of *Scripture in general*. But that sense cannot be admitted, since the context evidently leads us to *prophecy*. Rosenm. and Jaspis explain: “no prophecy can be expounded of itself, or by itself, nor understood without comparing together the prophecy and its event or completion, by the aid of history.” Which is very true; but not, I think, *the* truth intended by the Apostle; since it is agreeable to what follows: and this interpretation varies so entirely from the second mentioned one, that it cannot (as Mr. Slade supposes it may) be *united* with it. The one above adopted has been, of late, ably defended and illustrated by Knapp, ubi supra, and Rosenm. acknowledges that *thus* the verse will connect with the following.

21. οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη—ἄνθρωποι,
 “For prophecy was never uttered by the will of man, but the holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” Ἠνέχθη, *brought for-*

* It is thus expressed by Mr. Slade: “Prophecy gave no light to the age in which it was delivered, and therefore was a lamp shining in a dark place; and let this be impressed upon you, that prophecy was so entirely and exclusively designed for the benefit of future ages, that its import was not always fully understood even by the prophet himself, who was aware that his words were often inapplicable to the people immediately addressed (1 Pet. 1, 11 & 12.), and uttered them not from the suggestions or persuasions of his own mind, but from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.”

ward. The *οἱ* in *οἱ ἅγιοι* is omitted in some MSS., and bracketed by Vater, but wrongly (I think) since it bears the stamp of genuineness. The title *ἅγ. Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπ.* was commonly given to the Prophets. *Φερόμενοι*, *carried away, inspired*. Which (notwithstanding what Rosenm. says) throws light on the nature of inspiration. See Mackn.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. *ἐγένοντο—λαῶ.* This connects well with the preceding; showing that not *all* are prophets who call themselves such; many falsely assume the name. The Apostle, therefore, now turns from *true prophets* to *false teachers*. (Rosenm.) See the copious explanation, by Benson, of the contents of this Chapter, and the useful introductory remarks of Slade from Sherlock, Benson, Paley, and Dodd.

1. *ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται—ἀπώλειαν*, “There were, however, also *false* prophets among the (Israelitish) people; thus also will there be among you false teachers, who shall introduce pernicious heresies, even denying the Lord that purchased them (with his own blood); bringing thereby on themselves rapid destruction.”

As to the *persons* meant by these false teachers, and the nature of their opinions, there has been much debate. The common opinion is, that they were Nicolaitans, or Gnostics (persons who conjoined the Oriental philosophy with the Christian religion). But this has been convincingly refuted by Tittman de Vestigiis Gnostic. &c. Yet it is observed by Rosenm., that though the name Gnostics was not known in those times, yet the dogmas of those who, in the second century, were called Gnostics, might be known and disseminated. Others take them to have been Judaizers, who (like the Montanistæ and Sibyllistæ of the second and third centuries), abandoning the true doctrine, feigned oracles against the Roman government, and promised a new theatre of

pleasure to their votaries. These (I would observe) seem to have commenced with being fanatics, and ended with being hypocrites and knaves: and many opinions of the Mahomedan system seem to have been partly derived from that impure source. That their tenets were most pernicious, appears from the strong language of the Apostle at ver. 10.

Παρεισάξουσιν, “*shall clandestinely introduce, smuggle in.*”

This and the ἔσονται Storr understands not so much of *prediction*, properly so called, as *argumentantis*, or *consuetudinis*; as appears (he thinks) from the *historical* description which follows. But the *consuetudo* cannot well be thought of; and though the other may be tolerated, yet it is precarious and unnecessary. Αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας, i. e. pernicious and sectarian errors. On αἶρ. I have before treated. Καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἄρνούμενοι. On these words Commentators are not quite agreed. Some explain the δεσπότην of God. See Whitby, Bens., and Mackn., or Slade. But this is very harsh. It is far more natural to take it of Christ; as, indeed, the ἀγοράσ. requires; and the term δεσπ. differs scarcely at all from Κύριος. It is truly observed, too, by Pott, that the passages of the Old Testament, cited by Wets. and Benson, to establish the other interpretation, are of quite another kind. (See more in his note.) On what is meant by *denying* Christ as their Lord we are left somewhat in the dark, owing to a want of historical testimony. It cannot denote utterly denying his Messiahship, any more than, according to Pott's interpretation, denying Christ to be a Redeemer, for that would be equivalent to denying him to be the *Messiah*; neither will the construction of the words permit this. As to the sense proposed by Rosenm., “not sincerely worshipping Christ,” it is too vague and feeble. There seems to be here a *provincial brevity* of diction; and the sense is probably this: “denying him who purchased them (i. e. their Redeemer) to be their Lord.” Storr and Rosenm. conjecture that the controversy was “*de imperio Christi.*” It should seem that, from a misinterpretation of the words of the Apostle, they stumbled at the descriptions of the *majesty* of Jesus Christ and the ineffable glory of his second advent; and regarded the account of the Apostles on that subject as a fable devised to hold the disciples in subjection. Now this may possibly have been the case; but, if so, they must have denied the proper deity of Jesus Christ; and they probably held opinions not very different from those which afterwards generated Arianism and Socinianism; and therefore I must maintain that this text may, with great propriety, be adduced in controversy with persons professing such tenets. Now with this denial of the δεσποτεία of Christ was, as we learn from what follows (and this, indeed, we might expect), conjoined an impatience of *any* government, and the vices allied to such a restless spirit.

Ἀπωλείαν does not, perhaps, mean *perdition*; but rather κῆρυμα, *condemnation*, and consequently *punishment*. So in the next verse κῆρυμα and ἀπωλεία are used in a *parallelism*, as synonymous. And of some not dissimilar persons St. Paul (Rom. 13, 2.) says: οἱ δὲ ἀνεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κῆρυμα λήψονται.

2. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀπωλείαις. Many MSS., Versions, and Fathers read ἀσελγείαις, which is received by the recent Editors; but (I think) on very precarious grounds. One may imagine why ἀπωλ. should be changed into ἀσελγ.; but not vice versâ. That the term ἀσελ. was very applicable to the persons in question, must be acknowledged; and it seems to be more agreeable to what follows, the sense of which is, “on account of which the Christian religion (for that is what is meant by the *way of truth*) will be evil spoken of, and regarded as false.” I would compare Joseph. 1078, 5. ἀπιστίαν τῆς ἀληθείας κατέχεεν, “he scattered a disbelief even of truth; he made even truth to be disbelieved.” Whether the persons in question were Judaizers, or Gnostics, or Carpocratians, the words will equally hold good. See Irenæus, cited by Pott.

3. καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, “And through covetousness, they will make a mere gain of you (i. e. of teaching you), and hawk about such doctrines, as merchandize.” Mackn. here recognizes a prediction respecting the Romish Priests. Be that as it may, the words have been made good in them. The Apostle (I conceive) rather looks forward not so much to any particular persons, as to those perversions and abuses of the Gospel of which, from the corruption of human nature, its teachers in every age would furnish lamentable examples.

3. πλαστοῖς λόγοις. Of πλάττειν λόγους Wets. adduces two examples from Plato and Artemid.* Now these πλ. λόγ. consisted of speeches and doctrines

* I add Eurip. Bacch. 199. πλασταῖσι βακχεύουσιν. Isæus p. 70, 8. λόγοις πεπλασμένοις—ἀξιώσει πιστεύειν ὑμᾶς. Æschin. 31, 41. πρᾶγμα λέγων πεπλασμένον.

devised ad captandum, and adapted to the corruptions of human nature, by representing (as most Commentators suppose) the Christian freedom to be a license for doing what they pleased.

In the next words οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, the pen of the Apostle seems dipped in gall; but the language is justified by the occasion; and it is not to be explained away, and handled in the tasteless manner it is done by Potts, who, however, on the νυστάζει aptly cites Eurip. Hec. 662. οὗτοισ' ἐνδὲι λυπρὰ σου κηρύγματα. The νυστ. is indeed put for χρονίζεται. So Æschyl. Theb. 54. καὶ τῶνδε πύστις οὐκ ὄκνῳ χρονίζεται. The term ἔκπαλαι is disapproved of by the Greek grammarians, but used by many good authors. See Pott. None of the Commentators here remark on the change from the future to the *present* tense, by which the Apostle figures himself as present at the time when the abuses shall arise, and denounces the punishment as of old reserved for such deceivers.

4. Now follows the *reason* why these false teachers are punished by God, namely, since God always visits sin with punishment, and piety and virtue with reward; and this is shown by the examples which follow. In ver. 4—8. is contained the protasis; and in ver. 9 and 10. the apodosis.

Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, "For if (as we learn) the Lord spared not even the *angels*, that were disobedient and rebelled against him." Compare Jude 6. Ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τετηρημένους. Many MSS. read τηρουμένους. By the σειραῖς ζόφου Rosenm. understands places whose darkness held the prisoners, as it were, encaged, and with chains. And he refers to Sap. 17, (17) 18. ἀλύσει σκότους ἐδέθησαν. Schleus. too, after explaining σείραι ζόφου, as put for σείραι ζοφῶδεῖς, cites from Apulej. *tenebras arctissimas*; and refers to Hoelzl. on Ap. Rhod. 1, 218. It is strange none of the Commentators should have thought of Herod. 5, 77. where, in an Athenian inscription in the Acropolis, it is said of captives held in fetters: Δεσμῶ ἐν ἀχλυσέντι σιδηρέῳ ἐσβεσαν ὕβριν. So also Æschyl. Agam. 1631. ὁ δυσφιλὴς σκότῳ λίμος ξύνοικος. With which I would compare a similar elegance of Burns:

"Then age and want, O ill-matched pair,
Show man was made to mourn."

In some MSS. *Ζόφου* is omitted; but that is to avoid the difficulty; and the common reading is confirmed by a kindred passage of Jude 6.

Τεταρώσας, "hurled them down to hell." Every one will bring to mind the sublime description of Milton, *Parad. Lost*. *Τάρταρος* (plur. *τάρταρα*) is a word found in Homer and Hesiod, and signifies the lowest and darkest pit in the universe.* It is needless to enter into a description of what the antients figured to themselves under this notion. Suffice it to say, that the Apostle employs it as a most forcible adumbration of misery the most deplorable and hopeless. Rosenm. observes, that all along is to be supplied the consequence, "So then neither will God spare *others*." See Pole's *Syn.*, Whitby, and Mackn., or Slade.

5. καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξε. The ὄγδ. Νῶε signifies, "Noah, and seven others." An idiom found in the best writers from Herodotus and Thucydides downwards. Though it is usual to add the pronoun αὐτὸς. Such is the only explanation that can well be admitted. See Whitby, Hamm., and Rosenm. The most apposite passage cited is that from Polyb. 16, 2. (by Raphael), τρίτος αὐτὸς ὁ Διονυσιδωρος ἀνεγέξατο. Now Noah is called a κηρὺξ δικαιοσύνης, because he did his utmost to recall men from the error of their ways to a life of piety and virtue. See Hebr. 11, 7.

Κόσμου ἀσεβῶν, "the world consisting of ungodly persons." For all but Noah's family were such.

6. καὶ πόλεις—κατέκρινεν. Καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν is well explained by Rosenm., "condemned them to an overthrow;" as κατέκρ. αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, in Mark 10, 33. and elsewhere. Others render, "*punished* them with an overthrow." But that would be too harsh. Τεφρώσας, "burning to a cinder." So Philo 369. (cited by Loesner), ἡμέρα μιᾷ αἱ μὲν εὐανδροῦται πόλεις τάφος τῶν οἰκητόρων ἐγεγέννητο, αἱ δ' ἐκ λίθων καὶ ζύλων κατασκευαὶ τεφρὰ καὶ λεπτὴ κόνις.

* Of its origin the etymologists seem perfectly ignorant. (See Lannep. *Etym.*) I suspect it to be an *intensive reduplication* of the very old word *tar*, which in the earliest dialects seem to have signified *dark*; and indeed our term *tar* appears to be derived from a common source.

Ὑπόδειγμα, “an exemplar of the fate which the wicked may expect.” See Loesner and Hypke, and also Slade.

7. καὶ δίκαιον—ἐρρύσατο. Δίκαιον, *just*, as compared with the rest. The construction is: καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ. Καταπονεῖσθαι is nearly synonymous with βασανίζεσθαι. Ἀθεσμος is rarely used of *persons*. It here signifies *exlex*, a despiser of all laws. The term is applied to these, because they did not live after that primæval law, partly of nature and partly of tradition, with which they were favoured. (Rosenm.)

8. βλέμματι γὰρ—ἐβασάνιζεν. The construction is: ὁ γὰρ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἐβασάνιζε βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, ψυχὴν δικαίαν, ἀνόμοις ἔργοις. Βασανίζειν is here used in a figurative sense. Here again is to be supplied the consequence: “If God liberated those persons from afflictions, he can liberate us also.” (Rosenm.)

9. οἶδε Κύριος—πηρεῖν. It is well observed by Whitby, that God’s *knowledge* here, as often, includes his *power* and *will*. And indeed this is found in common phraseology. Πειρασμ. must here denote calamities for their trial and probation. The κολαζομένους is said to be for the future κολασθησομένους. The sense may be thus expressed: “who are to be punished.” It is observed by Rosenm., that by one remarkable example a general sentiment is inferred, namely, that the wicked will assuredly be punished, in whatever that punishment may consist. And Whitby well observes, that the evils the wicked suffer in this life will not exempt them from punishment in the life to come. See also Slade.

10. μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ παρευομένους. Πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς, like the parallel expression in Jude 7. (ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας), signifies all uncleanness, both fornication and adultery. Ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ, “in the lust of defilement and pollution.” The first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is the best commentary on

this passage. Σάρξ, in the sense in which it is here used, is rare in the Classical writers; but it occurs in Max. Tyr. D. 26, 5. 11, 21. ἐπὶ σαρκῶν ἡδονὰς συντετάμενος. and infr. § 7. οἰόμενος ἐν τῇ σαρκῶν φύσει κατορθοῦν τὸ καλόν. and 11, 31. ἐφ' ὕβριν σαρκῶν.

Κυριότητος καταφρονούντας, “despising (all authority of) magistrates.” Abstract for concrete. Then, by a sort of climax, the Apostle subjoins: *τολμηταί, αὐθάδες, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσι βλασφημοῦντες*. Here Bens., Pott, and Rosenm. subaud *όντες*. The sense is: “daring and self-willed as they are, they scruple not to speak evil even of rulers in high stations, nay, in the most exalted.” Such is by the best Commentators regarded as the sense. On *τολμ.* and *αὐθ.* see Pott or Schleus., to whose examples I add Thucyd. 1, 70. καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν *τολμηταί* παρὰ γνώμην *κινδυνευταί*, where I shall have many similar passages to cite.

11. ὅπου ἄγγελοι, &c., “Whereas angels, though far superior in strength and power, bring not a railing accusation against them (i. e. those of their body, the bad angels), at the tribunal of the Lord.” Most Commentators by *αὐτῶν* understand the *magistrates*, or bad. But I see not how that can be admitted: and it is well observed by Bens., that as it is a rule of interpretation that the plainer and larger account of any thing should be taken to explain what is more brief and obscure, so this may very well be explained from Jude 9., and if so, the other interpretation is the true one. See Bens., and compare the passages. And see also the note of Slade.

12. οὗτοι δὲ—καταφθαρήσονται. By the *ἄλογα ζῶα* are meant such as, like the animals devoid of reason, follow their sensual appetites. The *εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν* is (I conceive) a clause forming an epithet of *ζῶα*; and the sense is: “whose sole end of creation is the good of man, namely, to be taken and slaughtered for food (according to Gen. 1.), or because the good of man requires that they should be destroyed.” *Φυσικὰ* is variously explained. By some, thus:

“natural (i. e. naturally) brute beasts.” And this is supported by the passage of Jude. But I prefer, with Œcumen., of the antients, and most recent Commentators, to point : *ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα, φυσικὰ, γεγεννημένα*, &c., i. e. such as follow the impetus of sense, and are devoid of reason.

12. *ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες*, i. e. *βλασφημ. ταῦτά τὰ πράγματα ἐν οἷς ἀγν.* The *ἐν* corresponds to the Heb. *ב*. On the sense of the words the recent Commentators variously speculate. See Storr in loco, or as cited by Rosenm. *Ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται*. A fine antithetical expression, of which the sense is : “they shall perish for (or because) and by their own corrupt practices.”

13. *κοιμούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας*.

A bitter sarcasm. This must be closely connected with the preceding ; and the sense is : “Thus they shall receive the reward of their unrighteousness.” For examples of this sense of *μισθος* I refer to Herod. 3, 15. & 8, 90. Plut. 1, 705. and Soph. Antig. 814. On the participle *κοιμούμενοι* is, as if it were a verb, suspended another, which, together with the words following, seems to show the *reason why* they shall thus suffer, and in which the Apostle, with great spirit, resumes the charges just before made.

Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ. This is variously interpreted. Some, as Pott, Rosenm., and Schleus., take it (by an ellipsis of *ἐκάστη*) for *daily*. Est. and Grot., *ad breve tempus*. But it is justly remarked by Slade, that the former would require *καθ' ἡμέραν* ; and the latter, *εἰς ἡμέραν* (*ἐφ' ἡμέραν*, he means). I should not, however, rest much upon minute exceptions of this kind (since *ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι*, and many other expressions of the Apostle, would be vainly sought in the Classical writers), but that I conceive the sense (as Mr. Slade has shown) arising from both the above interpretations, is very inferior to that which the *common* one yields (in which I must acquiesce), namely, *in the day-time*. And this is defended by Rom. 13, 12 & 13. 1 Thess. 5, 7., and by what we know of the manners and customs of the East in every age ; for (as Rosenm. says) drunkenness in the *day-time* is seldom committed in the hot countries of the East (see Wets.). And (I would add) about sunset the *chief meal* is made, to intemperance in which, indeed, the *τρυνφήν* seems rather to point ; but the *ἡδον.* may as well admit the other sense. I find, too, in Plut. Arat. 6. *ἡδονὰς καὶ πότους μεθημερίνους* mentioned as a reproach. It is possible, too, that the Apostle might also have in view the *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους*, supra, ver. 10. Thus, among the reproaches with which Demosthenes overwhelms his great rival orator, we find de Corona §. μ. *ἡ μητὴρ σου τοῖς μεθημερινῶσι γάμοις ἐν τῇ κλισίᾳ χρωμένη*.

The Apostle thus proceeds, *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι*, "they are spots and blemishes," i. e. a scandal to the Christian profession. Abstract for concrete. Jude says *σπιλάδες*. *Σπίλος* signifies a *stain*; and *μῶμος* imports what we call an eye-sore, or blemish, literally, what a purchaser would find fault with. (See Benson.)

13. *ἐντροφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, συνευαχούμενοι ὑμῖν*. This is a somewhat obscure sentence, and variously interpreted. For *ἀπάταις* some, with a *very few* MSS., would read *ἀγαπαῖς*. And this seems to be countenanced by the passage of Jude: but there is so little authority for it, and it has so much the air of an *emendation*, that the soundest Critics reject it, retaining the *ἀπαταις*. The words are explained, by some recent Commentators (including Elsner and Rosenm.), of the wanton artifices by which these persons sought to seduce the women they found at the love-feasts to their base purposes. (See Rosenm.) And this is supported by an antient Scholiast ap. Matth., as also by Œcumen.; and is somewhat countenanced by the verse following. But, as Pott observes, that sense cannot fairly be elicited from the words. And he, in conjunction with Schleus., explains: "*oblectantes se in fraudibus suis et dolis, quibus utuntur ad alios decipiendos, et pecuniâ commungendos.*" But this is too bold, and is little agreeable to the context. Mr. Slade interprets: "Committing excess, when they feast with you, by means of their deceits and imposture." This I am not sure that I understand. Upon the whole, since the interpretation of Elsner is supported by the antients, and quite agreeable to the context, it must not (I think) be rejected on account of any petty exceptions to the phraseology. For the *ὑμῖν*, which, Pott says, is *required*, may be *understood* from the *ὑμῖν* in the next clause.

14. *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας*, "Having eyes full of (and gazing on) the adulteress, and that never cease from lasciviousness or wanton imaginations." See Benson and Doddr., partly from whom Rosenm. explains: "*Qui oculos habent plenos adulterâ, sunt impuri homines,*

qui ex adulteræ præsentis intuitu oculos pascunt, absentis imaginem quasi vivam et nunquam evanescentem in oculis ferunt, adeoque fervore quodam atque furore libidinis correpti sunt.”* For ἀκαταπαύστους some MSS. have ἀκαταπαυστα. But that is a mere emendation. The general sentiment is well expressed by Benson thus: They are men of insatiable lust: and in their eyes we might have read the lasciviousness of their hearts.

14. δειλιάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, “laying baits for unstable minds (i. e. persons not confirmed in Christian truth and practice) to draw them into error and lead them into vice.”

Now to these the Apostle subjoins *another* trait, which bears great affinity to luxury and lasciviousness, namely, *covetousness*; and this is expressed in the strongest terms, even “*a heart exercised with insatiable avarice*,” which indicates a deep-rooted and settled *habit*. I would compare Joseph. 1246, 11. γυμνάζοντες τὴν ἀπόνοιαν.

The Apostle then indignantly adds: κατάρως τέκνα! by which are denoted persons the most execrable.

15. καταλιπόντες τὴν εὐθείαν ὁδὸν, “After they have deserted the true religion, the way which the Apostles have pointed out.” Acts 13, 10. This is introductory to the comparison which follows.

Ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ Βοσὸρ. The force of the comparison rests in this, that as Balaam counselled the Moabites to entice the Israelites to illicit connection with their women, and thus lead them into idolatry, and draw on them the heavy punishment of God, so these

* Here Wets. cites Timæus ap. Longin. p. 20. τὴν ἀνεψίαν ἐτέρῳ δοθεῖσαν—ἄρπάσαντα ἀπαλθεῖν, ὃ τις ἂν ἐποίησε ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρας, μὴ πόρνas ἔχων; I add Max. Tyr. Diss. 26, 11, 25. ὃ λίχινου ἐρωτος καὶ ἀδίκων ἐγυπτιῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν ποιηρῶν & infra §. 8. ὅταν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ λιχνώσιν. Soph. Tr. 548. ὧν ἀφαρπάζειν φιλεῖ ὀφθαλμοῦς αἰθερος. Propert. 2, 12, 12. oculi sunt in amore duces. See also Eurip. Hipp. 525.

false teachers, by giving Christians a licence to commit immorality, namely, for the purpose of gratifying their own avarice, in like manner called forth the severe castigation of God. Such is the view taken by most Commentators. Perhaps, however, Peter had regard only to the *avarice* of Balaam, like whom these false teachers, for the purpose of gratifying that base passion, make a gain of the Gospel in the way above-mentioned. (Rosenm.) I cannot but prefer the common and more extensive sense, since that seems to be required by the force of the words themselves, and the circumstances of Balaam's case (on which see Whitby and Mackn.). For though we know nothing as to his *immorality*, yet avarice tempted him to commit a base violation of his duty as a Prophet, just as in the case of these false teachers, avarice and sensuality tempted them to falsify the Gospel, that they might make it the more productive of gain to expend on their own lusts.

Βοσδρ is thought to be a corruption of Βεωρ. See Grot. and Light., as also Rosenm. and Mackn. Ὁς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἡγάπησεν, “who was fond of gain even at the price of unrighteousness.” Rosenm. thinks it doubtful whether he *received* the gifts brought by the messengers or not; for that is not directly affirmed in Scripture. But, from the character of the man, there can be no doubt but that he did; and this the Jewish Interpreters, from Josephus and Philo downwards, have always taken for granted, and to it Peter evidently refers. See Whitby, who compares Deut. 23, 5. and Nehem. 13, 2.

16. ἐλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν—παραφρονίαν, “But he had a rebuker of his iniquity; for the dumb beast, speaking with the voice of a man, checked the mad folly of the Prophet.” At ὑποζύγιον must be understood κτήνος or ζῶον, Angl. a *pack-horse*, or *ass*, a beast of burden, and sometimes a horse *generally*: but, as Grot. observes, ὑποζυγ. is always used in the Sept. to denote an ass or mule; for *horses* Judæa did not

produce. On the miracle itself, at which infidels and sceptics have so unreasonably stumbled, this is no place to treat.

Παραφρονίαν is, I suspect, an idiotical or provincial term for παραφρόνησιν or παραφροσύνην. It must not be too rigorously interpreted, but, like ἄνοια in the Classical writers, taken to denote *extreme folly*. Nay, in this sense, even μονία occurs in Dionys. Hal. 1, 438, 11. See also Ecclesiast. 9, 3. And we often use similar words in a mild sense. Though the blind and infatuated folly of Balaam throughout this whole transaction, and his thus opposing the Divine will, were little less than madness.

17. οὗτοί εἰσι πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι, “These teachers and preachers are wells without water,” i. e. they grievously disappoint the expectation of all who seek the refreshment of gospel truth. “They pretended (observes Benson) to be fountains of deeper knowledge and greater purity than any others; but, when a man came thirsting after truth and righteousness, how great must be his disappointment when he found nothing but emptiness and vanity.” In this comparison (adds he) is pointed out their *ostentation* and *hypocrisy*. They made a show of something profitable and refreshing; but it was only a mere show. They were altogether empty and unprofitable: all appearance, but no reality.” See also Mackn.

17. νεφέλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμενοι. For νεφέλαι (which, however, occurs in Jude 12.), many MSS., Versions, Editions, and Fathers, have ὀμίχλαι. “Now ὀμίχλαι (says Rosenm.) are condensed clouds, and therefore very dark, yet not yielding rain.” And this (if it be not an emendation) seems more appropriate. For as *black* clouds excite a greater expectation of rain, so when they yield none, the disappointment is the greater. The comparison intended is plain. See Benson.

The denunciation then uttered against them is truly awful, and the terms expressive of it most sublime. Σκότου is meant (the Commentators say) to

increase the signification of *ζόφου*, i. e. it is for *ζόφος ὁ σκοτεινιώτατος*. Pott compares the terms *χθόνος πέδον συμφορὰ πάθους*, and *cœnum luti*. The *ζόφ.* is used, as at ver. 4. (and also Jude 6 & 13.), to denote *tartarus*, or *hell*. And so Homer, cited by Schleus. Lex.: *τάρταρον ἡέρόεντα, ζόφον ἡερ*. It is observed, by Rosenm., that the punishments of the other world were adumbrated not only under the image of burning, but utter darkness; as Matt. 8, 12. 22, 13. 25, 30.

18. *ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι*. Here (18 & 12.) we have the sentiment at ver. 17. further enlarged on, and the Apostle passes on from the metaphorical to the natural mode of expression. (Pott.) The words of this verse are well paraphrased by Benson thus: "They, in high-sounding words, and lofty, unmeaning phrases, make vain, boasting, and arrogant pretences to a more thorough and sublime knowledge of religion, than the true Apostles and Prophets: but, by preaching such doctrines as give indulgence to the lusts of the flesh, that is, to lasciviousness, they lay a bait for those who, by embracing Christianity, were thoroughly reformed, and had escaped from such as still continue to live in the error of idolatry and vice." (See his notes.) On *ὑπέρογκα* examples are adduced by Wets.; but not such as are apposite. I would add the following. Aristoph. Ran. 971. who calls the diction of Æschyl. *οἰδοῦσαν ὑπὸ κομπασμάτων καὶ ῥημάτων ἐπαχθῶν*. Polyæn. 749. s. f. *οὐ μόνον ἐξαρνος οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ πλείονα ὄγκον προστιθείς*. The genitive *ματαιότητος* is (by Hebraism) for the cognate adjective. *Ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις* is *not* (as some say) for *εἰς ἐπιθ.*, but the *ἐν* signifies, like the Hebr. *ב*, *by, through*. *Ἀσελγεία* is exegetical of the preceding. For *ὄντως* some very few MSS. and a few Versions read *ὀλίγως*. And this is approved by some Critics. But the word is hardly found any where else, and can scarcely admit of the sense *vix*, which they assign to it. I suspect the reading to have originated in a mere error by

mistake of the letters in the uncial characters, in which the words are strikingly similar. Thus "ONTΩΣ, "ΟΛΙΓΩΣ. Certainly *ὄντος* is far more apt. Mr. Slade thinks it was an *intentional* alteration. And he ingeniously accounts for it. (See his note.)

19. ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, i. e. "They held out to them both *religious* liberty, or a license to do what they pleased, without fear of Him who is invisible; representing that true knowledge or right faith would excuse defects in practice; and *political* liberty, pretending that the civil magistrates had nothing to do with them." See more in Whitby and Benson. Now this, it is said, they did, being all the while δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς,* i. e. enslaved to corruption, and therefore little able to teach true liberty. Φθορὰ is here used as at 1, 4. Ὡ γὰρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται. The sense here is plain, and is the same as at Joh. 8, 34. and Rom. 6, 16. where see the notes. Pott thinks this has the air of a proverb. Ἡτᾶσθαι τινι is for ἥτᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τινος,—a sort of Latinism. See on this subject a fine passage of Cowper's Task, B. 5., commencing with: "He is the free man whom the truth makes free," and ending with: "Whom God delights in, and in whom he dwells." See also Mackn. or Slade.

20. εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες—πρώτων. The sense is plainly that, now having become Christians, they are amenable to a severer punishment for vice than if they had continued Heathens. He that knew his Lord's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. Τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, "the contagion of immorality which prevailed in the world." Γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. Very similar words occur at Matt. 12, 45. and Luke 11, 16. Wets. compares Thucyd. 1, 86. διπλάσις ζημίας ἀξιοί εἰσιν, ἔτι ἀντ' ἀγαθῶν κάκοι γεγένηνται.

* With which I would compare Eurip. Hec. 858. Φεῦ, οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν, ὅστις ἔστ' ἐλεύθερος. Ἡ χρημάτων γὰρ δοῦλος ἐστίν, ἢ τύχης, Ἡ πλῆθος αὐτὸν πόλεος, ἢ νόμων γραφαὶ Εἵργουσι χρῆσθαι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην τρόποις.

21. κρείττον γὰρ—ἐντολῆς. Κρ., preferable and involving less blame and consequently punishment; since ignorance might have been some excuse. I would compare a similar sentiment in Max. Tyr. Diss. 12, 6. fin. 1, 226. φιλοσοφία δὲ καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἀρετὴ τοῖς ἅπασι. Φευγουσιν ἀβατος μένει καὶ ἀδιάλλακτος. The phrase ἀγία ἐντολή to denote the *injunctions of the Gospel*, is somewhat rare. The rest of the phraseology is plain.

22. συμβέβηκε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας. Τὸ τ. π., "what is said in the proverb." Rosenm. compares from Lucian: τοῦτο ἐκείνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας. There is here reference to *two* proverbs, one that on the dog, found in Prov. 26, 11., with this very application. Compare the Hebr. and the Sept. Other vestiges are found in allusions of Classical authors. So, among the passages collected from the Philologists by Pott, there is Arrian Epict. 4, 11. ἄπελθε καὶ χοίρῳ διαλέγου, ἵνα ἐν βορβώρῳ μὴ κυλίνεται. Yet this (as well as the others I have seen) alludes to the sow as fond of wallowing in mire, (which, Arist. H. A. 8, 6. says, helps to fatten them. And see H. A. 5, 45.); but I find no vestige of any *proverb* of this kind in the Classical writers. It is therefore probably an Oriental one; and there is a faint allusion to it in a passage of Sohar cited by Schoettg.: "Voluit Lot reverti ad sordes suas."

CHAP. III.

The Apostle here gives them to understand that he wrote this and the former Epistle, to put them in mind of Christ's final advent to judgment, and to excite them to prepare for it. But withal informs them that they must expect to hear the notion ridiculed by foolish and wicked men. To show how ill founded is this ridicule, he intimates that the first constitution of the earth was such as to occasion the Flood, and the present one tends to a dissolution by

fire, which will take place at its appointed time; and that the reason why it is delayed, is, to give men an opportunity for previous preparation [a reason for this delay also assigned by St. Paul. Edit.]. That when the purposes of God are accomplished, the day of the Lord will come suddenly, and the world be destroyed by an universal conflagration; after which there will be new heavens and a new earth for the righteous. Finally, that it highly behoved them to prepare for that awful consummation. (Bens.)

VER. 1, 2. ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῇ διάνοιαν, “in (both of) which I stir up your sincere and well-meaning hearts by admonition.” With ἐν αἷς for ἐν ᾗ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ, Pott compares a similar *synthesis* in Anton. 2, 4. Διεγειρῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει he takes for διεγείρειν καὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν. And he considers διεγ.—διάνοιαν as put, by hypallage, for “excite to the preservation of a sincere mind.” And so Rosenm. But this is too harsh. The sense, I conceive, is what is expressed above. Their minds were worthy and well meaning, but needed exhortation. See Benson.

2. μνησθῆναι—προφητῶν, “that ye may be mindful of the things predicted by the holy Prophets,” namely, in the way of caution concerning the deceivers before mentioned. So Rosenm. Or it may be understood, in a general way, of the things pertaining to the advent and kingdom of Christ. On ἀγ. see the note on 2 Pet. 1, 21. Καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς, τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος, “the injunctions and doctrines of us who are the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.” A *trajectio* for καὶ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐμῶν, τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος. So Rosenm. and Pott, the latter of whom compares Jude 17. Other modes of interpretation may be seen in Wolf, Bens., and Pott. But all involve more or less of harshness. Pott and Rosenm. unite in taking ἐντολή to mean *doctrine*, which I have *included*, but as a *secondary* sense; for it has (I think) been proved by Benson that the other is the primary one.

3. ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχατου τῶν ἡμερῶν—ἐμπαῖκται.

After τῶν ἡμερῶν some MSS. Versions and Fathers add ἐν ἐμπαιγμῶν, which will be for ἐν ἐμπαιγμῇ, since ἐμπαιγμὸς and ἐμπαιγμα denote *derision*, *ridicule*. These words, whether they be joined with ἐλεύσονται, (as being put for ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ,) or be construed with ἐμπαῖκται, are *not* a mere Hebrew redundancy, to increase the strength of the sentiment. (Rosenm.) By the πρῶτον is not so much to be understood what was to happen first, as (with Bens.) a *premise* from whence they might conclude they ought to remember the predictions of the Prophets and the injunctions of the Apostles. See the note on 1, 20. And so Pott and Rosenm. Ἐπ' ἐσχέτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, sub. μέρους. Some understand this of the period of the last dispensation to man, the whole of the times of the New Testament. But this is too harsh. Others, as Bens., interpret it of the *Jewish system*. But, as the destruction of Jerusalem happened about three years after, the Apostle would scarcely have said ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται. Yet it is remarked by Mr. Slade, that the scoffers were *soon* to come; otherwise there would have been no need to caution the disciples against them; and in the days of Jude (see his Ep. 18 and 19.) they *were* come; and therefore the passage relates to some event or judgment near at hand. To this I cannot but assent; and, though the interpretation of Pott and Rosenm. *tandem, posthac*, is very plausible, yet it seems so much a device for the nonce, to escape the difficulty, that I prefer understanding the words, with many Commentators, and, amongst the rest, Mr. Slade, both of the *destruction of Jerusalem* and the *final advent to judgment*; and I cannot but accede to his mode (at ver. 7.) of accounting for the two subjects being here connected.

Ἐμπαῖκτοι, *scoffers*. Benson remarks that he should have taken these to have been the Sadducees among the Jews, and the Epicureans among the Heathens (who made a jest of religion and a future state), had it not been for the parallel passage of Jude 18 and 19., from which it appears that they had been professors of the Christian religion, though now tainted with Sadducean and Epicurean sophisms. As to ridicule being the test of truth, or the way to find it out, that (he thinks) is disputable. "Certain it is (continues he) that such scoffers seldom attend to evidence, and seem not much concerned to find out and retain the truth, however they may excite persons well disposed to enquiry to place it in a clearer light, and to show their ridicule ill founded." See also Mackn.

3. κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, "living after their evil lusts." See Mack. and Bens. ap. Slade; and compare 1 Tim. 4, 1. 2 Tim. 3, 1. Rosenm. extends the πορ. to sentiments as well as morals and actions.

4. καὶ λέγοντες· Ποῦ ἐστιν—αὐτοῦ. By the αὐτοῦ is plainly meant Christ. From the character of the men, this cannot import any enquiry in the promises of

Christ's coming in Scripture; nor is it to be thought (with some) that they expected his second coming, and thought it long. This is merely to be regarded as a popular form of expression, not dissimilar to some in our own language, in which was implied a disbelief that he will come *at all*, and an insinuation that there was no hope of an event so long delayed. So Bens. paraphrases; "Where is the promised advent of Christ? what proof or sign of his appearing again?" And he adds, that by this coming is evidently meant the advent to *judgment*; as the context requires. See the note on 2 Thess. 2, 1. Thus they stifled at once the fears of the wicked, and the hopes of the righteous. Indeed there were some things in the then state of the world, which, from a misunderstanding of our Lord's predictions, might encourage such scepticism.

4. ἂφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτω διαμένει ἂπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. Rosenm. paraphrases: "Our Fathers have successively died, nor has any one come to life. And as from the creation of the world all things are carried on by an alternate course of living and dying, so does the order of nature remain the same. Thus they will fancy, that what has been so long deferred will never come to pass."

5—7. The Apostle means here to refute the scoffers, who said that the whole system of nature remained, and would always remain in the state it had been in from the creation, nor would the world ever be destroyed (ver. 4). Against these, then, he shows that all things have *not* remained in the state in which they were created by God; for that the world (i. e. our earth with its atmosphere) had once been destroyed by *water* (ver. 5 and 6.), and would again be destroyed in like manner, even by *fire*. This those scoffers did not, or would not, know. (Rosenm.)

5. λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας. Most Commentators and Translators, from Beza and Luther, take the θέλοντας for θελότως, or ἐθελόντι, *spondite*. But this yields a precarious and frigid sense. Θελ. has (I think) no where that signification at the end of a sentence. Wells and Slade interpret, *wilfully*. But for this there is no authority. I prefer, with Heins., Mede, Hamm., and many recent Commentators, as Rosenm., to take θέλοντας for *existimantes*, *quia existimant*,—a frequent sense both in Greek and Latin. This indeed would properly require the *article*, which, however, might easily, by a writer so little attentive to the nicer proprieties of the

language, have been omitted ; or it might have been absorbed by τούς preceding. The sense, then, seems to be : “ those who think,” namely, ὅτι πάντα οὕτω διαμένει.

By the οὐρανοὶ (as Rosenm. observes) are meant, not the *ætherial*, but the *aëreal* heaven, the *atmosphere* encircling the globe. The Apostle, it must be observed, speaks in the *popular* manner, and not with philosophical precision, which indeed in that age was very inconsiderable, compared to the knowledge of our great modern Astronomers.

The words καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα are variously explained. Most Commentators take συνεστῶσα to mean *standing out* : and Camerar. regards the ἐξ as put for ἐκτος and πρὸς ὕδατι, and the διὰ for μετὰ ὕδατος, or ἐν μέσῳ ὕδατος. Grot. refers the συνεστ., by *zeugma*, to the heaven as well as the earth ; so that Peter may be understood as saying that the earth emerged from the water ; and thus συνεστῶσα will be equivalent to σύστασιν ἔχουσα. But the Apostle seems not to have spoken with reference to *cosmogony*, but (as most recent Commentators after Capellus suppose,) meant to have συνεστ. taken in the sense *consist, subsist*. See Kypke, Elsn., Pole, and Rosenm., or Slade.

5. τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, “ by the fiat of God.” So elsewhere in Scripture.

6. δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδατι κατακλυθεὶς ἀπώλετο.

The δι' ὧν is by some, as Beza and Rosenm., taken for διὸ, *proinde*. Pott, however, objects that for this there is no authority. And he, with Causaub. and many others, subauds ὑδάτων. To which Rosenm. objects, that the *singular* just after occurs. Either of the two interpretations may be admitted ; but not the subaudition of οὐρανῶν, with the antients, and Mede, Beza, Wets., Whitby, Wolf, and Benson. The ὁ τότε κόσμος is by almost all explained, the world and its inhabitants, as they existed at the Deluge recorded by Moses. But since the opposition is not ὁ νῦν κόσμος, but οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆ, Rosenm. thinks that the Apostle distinguishes these heavens and this earth from *others*. And he would understand, not the deluge in the time of Noah, but some *former* one ; adopting the opinion of Burnet, in his Theory of the Earth, L. 3., C. 11., that there was quite a different appearance of earth and heaven before the deluge in the time of Noah. He then adds : “ Verisimilis est mihi eorum sententia, qui statuunt, orbem terrarum diu post primam illam universi hujus creationem, inundatione quadam universali, illo Noachico diluvio multo terribiliore et diuturniore penitus esse devastatum, omnibusque quibus antea ornatus erat rebus spoliatum ; renovatum autem deinde a Deo, et habitationem factam esse hominum et animalium, hancque metamorphosin describi a Mose.” A conjecture indeed highly ingenious, and which is thought by natural Philosophers to be somewhat confirmed by the recent discoveries in geology. But it is in vain to seek for any support to it in the words of the Apostle, which, if taken in a popular sense, are quite consistent with the deluge in the time of Noah ; and as *that* is especially adduced as an example and warning in a similar passage of Matt. 24, 37—39., so it seems to be meant *here*.

7. οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ γόγω τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσι.

“ But the present heaven and earth, by the same fiat (of God) remain.” Τεθησαυρισμένοι is well rendered by Schl. Lex. *repositi et asservati*. Πυρὶ τηρούμενοι, “ being reserved unto fire unto the day of judgment, in which the wicked will come to perdition.” That the world would be sometime destroyed by fire was the opinion not only of the Jews, but of most of the Heathen Philosophers, especially the Stoics. Of this the Commentators adduce abundant proofs and illustrations, which I must omit; only observing, that no good natural Philosopher could come to any other conclusion, who reflected on the combustible and agitated state of the interior of this globe. From the interesting account of the Island of Owhyhee lately published by an intelligent Missionary we find, that the whole of that Island, of more than 4000 square miles, seems to be situated on the funnel of an immense submarine volcano, since the whole Island is composed of Lava in different stages of decomposition, and changes of many miles in extent, by which whole bays are filled up, &c., show the awful power of the fire beneath.

8. ἐν δὲ τοῦτο—ἡμέρα μία. The ἐν τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς is a most solemn formula of soliciting serious attention; and the scope of the following passage is, to show *why* the Lord defers the last judgment from day to day; namely, out of his singular patience and clemency: and this is prefaced with the remark, that periods often seem to us long, which are short. The saying that one day is with God as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day, was frequent with the Hebrews; as we find from the Rabbinical writers. It occurs in Ps. 90, 4. The Apostle means, that we are only to take especial care that that time, whensoever it shall come, may not find us unprepared. That to our minds some things seem long, and some things short; but to God nothing is either long or short; and he shows the same faithfulness in what he renders late as what early. (Rosenm.) See Bens. and Mackn. Here Wets. compares Plut. 111 c. and 554 d. λέγω δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸν πολλὸν χρόνον· ἐπεὶ τοῖς γε θεοῖς πᾶν ἀνθρωπίνου βίου διάστημα τὸ μηδὲν ἐστι· καὶ τὸ νῦν ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸ ἐτῶν λ. τοιοῦτον ἐστιν, οἷον τὸ δείλης, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρῶτ' στρεβλοῦν, ἢ κρεμαννύναι τὸν πονηρὸν.

9. οὐ βραδύνει ὁ Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (ὡς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται), “ The Lord does not procrastinate as to his promises, as some think (attributing to him)

a slowness of performance." Such appears to be the true sense of these words, somewhat obscure from brevity. At the ἐπαγγ. is to be supplied ἐνεκα, *quod attinet ad*, or the like: and by *promise* is meant *fulfilment of promise*, by a common metonymy: so that there is no need to supply (with Schleus.) ἀναπλήρωσιν, or τελείωσιν; still less, to resort to any change of reading (with Grot.), or unauthorized construction (with Mackn.).

9. ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς, "But shows long-suffering towards us," i. e. does this, to evince his long-suffering towards us. As the Philological Commentators here fail us, the following passages may be acceptable. Aristoph. Av. 1620., εἰάν τις ἀνθρώπων ἱερεῖον τῷ Θεῶν εὐξάμενος, εἶτα διασοφίζεται, λέγων, μεnéτοι Θεοὶ (the Gods will wait), ἀναπραξόμεν καὶ ταῦτα: where the Schol. explains: ἀνεξίκακοι καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως τιμωρούμενοι. Schol. on Soph. Trach. 274., οἶοι οὐδὲ αὐτὸ τὸ Θεῖον ὕβριζόμενον κηρυττεῖ, ὃ λίαν ἐστὶν ἀνεκτικώτατον. With the *sentiment* compare Rom. 2, 4., 9, 22., where see the notes.

9. εἰς μετανοίαν χωρήσαι. This seems to be a popular form for μετανοεῖν, though it is found in Plut., cited by Wets.: εἰς μετανοίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πραχθεῖσι χώρησας. Kypke compares Philemon apud Stob. serm. 66., p. 421., γαμεῖν δς ἐθέλει, εἰς μετανοίαν ἔρχεται. Yet I think, with Rosenm., that it is a stronger expression than μετανοεῖν, and may be rendered *se convertere, confugere ad pœnitentiam*, to betake oneself to repentance.

10. ἥξει δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ. The words ἐν νυκτὶ are not found in some antient MSS., many Versions, and some Fathers: and as one can so much more easily account for their addition than their omission, they are rightly cancelled, or bracketed. Yet if they be not *understood*, much of the force of the comparison will be lost. By the ἡμέρα is undoubtedly meant the day of judgment, which will come upon men as unexpectedly as a thief in the night.

Οἱ οὐρανοί, i. e. the æreal heaven, the atmosphere; as at ver. 6. Ποτεῖνδόν, "with a mighty crash." Hesych. explains it σφοδρῶς,

ἡχητικόν. It signifies properly *whiz*; and then the noise made by any falling body (so Lycophr. cited by Wets.: Πύργων ἀπ' ἄκρων πρὸς νεόδμητον ρεκὺν ροιζήδον ἀεβράσσα κύμβαχον δέμας. and Hero ap. Musæus 339. ροιζήδον προκάρηνος ἀπ' ἡλιβάτου πέσε πύργου), or body impelled to perpetually accelerated motion. The word (Bens. observes) is used to express the hissing noise of a dart passing through the air, the flight of birds, the swift motion of the winds, the running of a chariot, the rulling of an impetuous torrent, the noise of soldiers running to battle, the crackling of a wide-spreading fire, the rushing sound of a violent storm or tempest." Παύρεσθαι properly signifies to pass *by*, and also *away*, and also (as here) to *perish*, i. e. as to the purpose it had served. So Bens. observes, that "it is not necessary to suppose, with some, that the world will be annihilated, or removed with its atmosphere, from its present orbit. It may be said to '*pass away*,' if the form and constitution be altered; as the old world is at ver. 6. said to have been destroyed by water."

Στοιχεῖα δὲ κανσούμενα λυθήσονται. Commentators are not agreed what sense to ascribe to στοιχεῖα. Some understand the *air*. Others the *stars*, or heavenly bodies. And so Mede, Wolf, Whitby, Wells, &c. But, as Rosenm. rightly remarks, that interpretation rests on no sufficient ground. Slade thinks it cannot properly mean the elements: and he would refer it to οἱ οὐρανοί, which goes before, and explain it (with Mackn.) of the electric matter, the sulphureous vapours, and whatever floats in the air, together with the air itself. But this cannot (I think) be admitted. I most approve of the interpretation of Rosenm. (from Bens.): partes, etiam aspectabiles, ex quibus omnes res naturales, quæ sub cælo sunt, componuntur. So Bens.: "Suppose that the *earth*, *air*, and *water* shall all be subdued by the prevalence of fire; and their stamina, or first and constituent principles, quite altered thereby; then it may very properly be said, *The elements being on fire shall be dissolved*. Again, what is here called the elements being dissolved, is at ver. 12. called their being melted. They are not, therefore, to be annihilated, but subdued, and greatly altered by the prevalence of fire."

Καὶ γῇ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα κατακαίσεται. By the ἔργα Rosenm. (after Heins.) understands, quæcunque industria hominis aut labore parta ministerio ejusdem cedunt atque usui, dicuntur: inter quæ, ut facultates ac opes, ita quæ ex arte ac ingenio proveniunt. 'Εν αὐτῷ, for ὑπ' αὐτῷ. The sense is: "the works of both nature and art, each of the most stupendous or exquisite sort, all shall be involved in overwhelming ruin." To use the words of our *English* Æschylus, "The cloud-capt towers, the gorgeous palaces, the solemn temples, the great globe itself, and all that it inherits, shall dissolve, and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, leave not a rack behind!"

11, 12. ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς. Ποταπός, is more significant than ποῖος. What follows contains

the answer to this interrogation. And Benson observes that, in the common way, the question and answer are intermingled. Indeed this is frequent in the popular style. Possibly, however, there may be no interrogation at all, but only an exclamation.

In εὐσεβείαις, which is exegetical of ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, the plural refers to the number. The words προσδοκῶντας, &c. are either in answer to the interrogation, or exegetical of the preceding, for (δεῖ ὑμᾶς) προσδοκῶντας εἶναι. Σπεύδω is not here to be taken in its usual active sense, but in one in which it occasionally occurs in good authors, *adfectare*, *earnestly desire*. And this is what the Vulg. and Beza meant by *properantes in*, or *ad*, which Pott, without reason, censures. The *ad* answers to *ad* in *adfectare*. Rosenm. well explains it *cupidus esse*, *adfectare*, *avidè desiderare*; referring (after Kypke) to Eurip. Hec. 1175 and 120. (See more in Wolf, Wets., and Kypke.) This indeed is a very frequent sense in the best writers.

At δι' ἣν Rosenm. subauds ἡμέραν, taking it for ἡ ἡμέρα. And so the E. V. But I prefer, with Bens., Grot., Est., Pisc., &c. παρούσιαν. Πυρρούμενοι, i. e. “melted like metal in a furnace:” for the verb is often so used. Τήκεται, “are (to be) dissolved.” So Is. 64, 1. ὅρη τακήσεται. See notes on ver. 7 and 10.

13. καινὸς δὲ οὐρανὸς—προσδοκῶμεν, i. e. a new universe. And this the Hebrews designated by the expression, as Gen. 1, 1. The sense is, that from the reliques of the antient fabric another and better will arise. This may be understood either *physically*, of a better corporeal world, or *figuratively*, of the new state of things in the eternal and blessed abodes of heaven. (Ros.) Κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα. Is. 65, 17. & 66, 22. See more in Bens. It is proved by Whitby and Mackn., that there can here be no reference to the Millenium. See their notes, or the extracts in Slade.

13. ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ, “in which righteousness

alone (i. e. the righteous) is to dwell, and not, as in the present one (see Matt. 25, 32.), mixed with *wickedness*" (i. e. the wicked).

14. ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες, σπουδάσατε — εἰρήνη, "Wherefore, seeing that ye expect such things (are sometime to happen) strive, by being spotless and blameless, to be found of him in peace." Or ἄσπιλ. and αμ. may be taken with εὐρεθῆναι. The sense is much the same. Ἐν εἰρήνῃ may be rendered, with Carpz. and others, *cum bona conscientia*, i. e. in peace with their consciences, or (as Pott explains) with *each other*. But the context rather requires the common interpretation, "in peace with *their great Judge*." An expression which can require no explanation. Thus it is not necessary, with Rosenm., to take it for εἰς εἰρήνην, "for your good and happiness."

15. καὶ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν, σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθε, "And reckon (as you justly may) that this long extended waiting, and forbearance of the Lord is meant to be our salvation, i. e. to promote it (by giving us an opportunity for *working it out*)."

See Bens., whose subaudition, however, of εἰς is inadmissible. On the *sentiment* I could adduce several Classical passages, but I forbear.

15. καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ὑμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν αὐτῷ δοθείσαν σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν. Rosenm. observes, that the καθὼς is not to be referred to the preceding words only, but also to ver. 14. He does not say that Paul used the same words, but that he wrote of the same things." Now ἀδελφὸς Peter might well call him, since he was a brother *Apostle* as well as brother *Christian*. Ἐγραψεν ὑμῖν, "hath written to you."* To what Epistle this alludes

* It is well observed by Bens., that St. Peter addressed his Epistles to the *Christians* dispersed in Asia Minor; and therefore the ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν shows that some Epistles of St. Paul are here alluded to, that were sent to the *same persons*." Now, although we find no Epistle of St. Paul immediately addressed to any of the provinces mentioned at 1 Pet. 1, 1.; yet it is probable from Eph. 1, 1. that all the Epistles (not excluding, as Doddr. think, even that to

Commentators are not agreed. The subject in question is treated of at Rom. c. 2, 9 & 11., and especially at Hebr. 10., and elsewhere. Indeed, St. Peter is justified in saying that his beloved brother has spoken of these things in *all* his Epistles. See the long list of similar passages adduced from St. Paul's Epistles by Benson and Slade.

16. ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ δυσνόητά τινα—ἀπαλείαν. It has been matter of great dispute among critics whether ἐν οἷς, or ἐν αἷς, be the true reading. If the *former* be adopted, the *subjects* will be meant. And this is supported by incomparably the greater number of MSS., and by most Commentators and critics. If the *latter* be adopted, the Epistles themselves and the Apostle's *method of treating the subjects* will be intended. And this is supported by some valuable MSS., both the Syriac Versions, the Arab., &c. (See Griesb.) It is also defended by Beza, Germ., Mill, T. Smith, and Bens., and recently by a scholar scarcely inferior to any of these, Dr. Maltby, Sermon 1, 419., who observes that it “agrees infinitely better with the context; though (for reasons which will readily occur to the minds of critics) the other might, at an early period, usurp its place.” For my own part, I would retain the *common* reading, which I think came from the Apostle: but it seems to me probable that he had in mind as well the *difficulty of the style and manner*, as the *abstruseness of the subjects*. And it is strange Mr. Slade should so warmly repel the “charge” of “obscurity” made against St. Paul's Epistles; which he thinks the greatest injustice. Surely if he had but considered that many causes contribute to produce this, without reflecting any blame on the Apostle, and im-

the *Romans*), though addressed to particular churches, were meant for *general circulation*; and therefore the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Timothy, were in some measure meant for the Asiatic churches in general. And at all events, there must have been many among those to whom St. Peter addresses himself, that were St. Paul's converts.

peaching the ways of Almighty Providence, he would have forborne language so inconsistent with his usual good sense.

On the nature of these difficulties many eminent Commentators have treated. See the Preliminary Essays and Dissertations of Mackn., the Preface of Locke to his Paraphrase on the Epistles, and an admirable Sermon on this text by Bp. Atterbury, vol. 3. p. 29. On difficulty of interpretation in general I would cite Jambl. de Vit. Pyth. C. 1. s. f. τὸ μαθήμασιν ἀπεξενωμένοις καὶ τισὶν ἀπορρήτοις συμβόλοις ἐπικεκρύφθαι, ψεύδεσί τε καὶ νόθοις συγγράμμασιν ἐπισκιάσσεσθαι· ἄλλαις τε πολλαῖς τοιαύταις δυσκολίαις παραποδίζεσθαι· ἐξαρκεῖ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ τῶν θεῶν βούλησις, μεθ', ἧς καὶ τὰ τούτων ἔτι ἀπορώτερα δυνατόν ὑπομένειν.

By the ἀμαθεῖς are meant those not well acquainted with the subjects discussed, and also the style of writing, and unskilled in interpretation in general. Ἀσθητικοὶ, “without fixed or solid principles of Christian knowledge.” Στρεβλοῦσιν, *wrest, pervert*. See Slade. By the ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς Grot. has rightly observed may be understood the Gospels and Acts then published, and in the hands of most Chrstians. But surely the books of the *Old Testament*, especially the prophetical ones, must be *included*. And so Germ. and Hamm. Πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπωλείαν. Most Commentators take the ἀπωλείαν to denote perdition, eternal punishment in another world. Most recent ones render it *ad perniciem*, namely (says Rosenm.), by approaching them with an evil mind, and pernicious prejudices. So Bens.: “The fault was not in the Scriptures, but in themselves. They were resolved to continue in their vices, and to support themselves therein; and came to read the Scriptures without a love of truth and righteousness; and to find in them what would answer their corrupt views.” The truth perhaps lies in the medium. The εἰς may denote *tendency* to perdition, namely, if the corruption be wilful, or

might have been avoided by proper means, or not duly repented of. See note on 2 Pet. 2, 1.

17. ὑμεῖς οὖν—στηριγμοῦ. Προγινώσκοντες, “previously warned of these perils and dangers.” Φυλάσσειν is here used in a reciprocal sense, as often in the Classical writers. See Wets. The sense is: “be on your guard.” Τῶν ἀθεσμῶν πλάνη συνπαχθέντες, “hurried away by the error and deceit of those lawless (scoffers),” mentioned *supra*, 2, 7. In συναπ. there is a metaphor taken (as Bens. says) from a torrent. See Gal. 2, 13. The ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ is well opposed to the ἀστηρικτοὶ at ver. 16. Στηριγ. denotes constancy in the *faith* as well as in the purity of doctrine. On ἐκπίπτ. see Gal. 5, 4. and the note there.

18. αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι—Χριστοῦ. In αὐξ. there is an idiom (elsewhere found), by which with the sense of the verb is conjoined a notion of *endeavour*; i. e. “strive, endeavour, seek to grow in.” I would render: “strive to grow in the grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ,” or “in the favour of Jesus Christ and the knowledge of his religion,” which would tend to the other. It is not necessary, with Rosenm., to suppose an hendiadis.

On the doxology here addressed to Christ see Bens., or Slade.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF ST. JOHN.

CHAP. I.

The contents of ch. 1, 1—11. are as follows. The doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ taught by the Apostles, is of divine revelation. Christians are to imitate the perfections of God; the light of holiness is to be studiously followed, and the darkness of sin avoided. On this condition only is the forgiveness of sins, obtained by the death of Christ, to be expected. The slaves of sin are the enemies of God. Sinners are benefited by the atoning blood of Christ, if they obey his precepts and follow his example. Now this had already been inculcated by Christ himself. (Knapp and Rosenm.)

1. ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, "That which took place from the first promulgation of the Gospel, which we (i. e. I) have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have surveyed, and which even our hands have handled, concerning (I say) the Logos, and author of everlasting life." The sentence is completed at ver. 3., ver. 2. being parenthetical. The ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Bp. Bull, Carpzov, and others, understand of the beginning of the world; as 3, 8., taking the ὁ as neuter for masculine. But this, though true in one sense, cannot (on account of the context) be considered as *the truth here* meant. So Rosenm. observes, that from the context it is plain the *subject* is the Λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, whose history, St. John affirms, was perfectly known to himself and the other Apostles. The ἀρχὴ is explained, by most modern Commentators, of the *entrance of Christ upon his ministry*, and the first promulgation of the

Gospel. See Rosenm., Mackn., Benson, and Whitby, which last Commentator adduces as examples of this sense of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Joh. 15, 27. Acts 1, 21. 1 Joh. 2, 7 & 24. 3, 10, 2 Joh. 5. Εἶναι is here, as often, used of *action*. The expressions ἀκηκόαμεν, ἐωράκαμεν, &c. constitute a form of protestation usual in cases of seeming improbability. There is, too, a *climax*. See Slade. The ἐθεασάμεθα is a stronger term than ἐωράκαμεν, and answers to our *survey*, *inspect*, implying accurate knowledge. The αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν refers to what is recorded at Joh. 22, 27. See Doddr. Mackn. thinks it may also apply to the other opportunities the disciples had of handling their master, and knowing that he had a real body. The plural ἡμῶν is, by most recent Commentators, supposed to be put (after the manner of the sacred writers, especially St. Paul) for the *singular*. But it may be intended to include the other Apostles. It is observed, by Rosenm., that St. John here appeals to the testimony of the senses, because of false teachers, who had neither seen nor heard Christ; and he then briefly repeats what he had more fully said in the Preface to his Gospel, 1, 1—14., meaning (as it seems) to show what followed from the accounts contained in the Gospel both for doctrine, and practice.

1. τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς. Thus at Joh. 1. Christ is called both the ὁ λόγος, and ἡ ζωὴ. Slade explains: "Jesus Christ, the author and principle of life." And so Hardy: "qui est essentialiter *ipsa vita*, et causaliter fons et auctor vitæ."

2. καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη. These words are, in the best editions, thrown to ver. 2., with which the present verse is closely connected, forming part of the parenthesis of which it consists. The sense is: "For Jesus Christ, the author of life and salvation, was manifested," namely, ἐν σαρκί; as at 1 Tim. 3, 16. Καὶ (like the Heb. ו) is for γὰρ, as not unfrequently in the simple diction.

2. τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,

“ We (I say) having seen him, do bear testimony to, and announce to you the (author of) eternal salvation, who was with the Father, but has been manifested to us.” On the sublime sense of ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα see Joh. 1, 1 & 2. and the note. Both passages supply an irrefragable proof of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ.

3. ὁ ἐωράκαμεν. There is here (as Erasm., Beza, Zeger, and Benson observe) a resumption of what was before said; q. d. “ That (I repeat) which we have seen and heard.” Rosenm. recognizes a προ-θεραπεία; q. d. “ wonderful, nay, incredible it may seem that the Son of God assumed the human nature! but no other than what we *know*, and what we have *seen*, declare we unto you.” The next words show the *purpose* of the thus announcing it, namely, “ that ye also may have communion with us, and participate in the benefits which we enjoy from this religion.” Καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ—Χριστοῦ, “ Now our communion is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” The δὲ is variously rendered; and by some it is thought pleonastic; but I prefer, with Rosenm., the sense *jam vero, now*. The purpose of the sentence is (as Est. observes) to show the dignity of this communion. On the nature of the connection, the reader may consult Morus ap. Rosenm.

4. καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πε-
πληρωμένη, “ These things write we unto you, that your joy may be complete and full, by attaining the end of your hopes, even everlasting life.” Others for ὑμῶν read ἡμῶν. But the common reading is defended by Joh. 3, 29. and 2 Joh. 11. See Carpzov.

5. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία—ὑμῖν. There are few points on which Critics are so agreed as that for ἐπαγγελία we should read ἡ ἀγγελία, with many excellent MSS., Versions, and Fathers. “ For (say they) the context requires, not *promise*, but *message* and *declaration*.” And so the E. V. This, indeed, is very true; but ἐπαγγελία has sometimes that sense; as in 2 Tim. 1, 1. and Polyb. 24, 10, 8.

Yet as ἀγγελία frequently occurs in St. John, it seems to deserve the preference. Rosenm. renders it *doctrine*. But this is too arbitrary. If we unite the senses of declaration, precept, and message, we shall (I think) attain the full sense. The idea *message* is required by the ἀναγγ.

5. ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστι—οὐδερμία. It is well observed, by Carpzov, that the phrases ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι or μένειν ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ εἶναι μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, also ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι, and finally εἶναι τὸ τέκνον τοῦ Θεοῦ and ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας. all these St. John had heard from Jesus himself, as well as many other recondite phrases which he has adduced in his Gospel. With respect to the φῶς, this is a symbol of what is most pure and lovely, and, as the best Commentators are agreed, denotes the wisdom, holiness, truth, purity, and other attributes of the Supreme Being. By σκοτία is, on the contrary, meant moral imperfection; for *darkness* is a symbol of ignorance, vice, misery, &c. In the application of this to practical use, it may be well to bear in mind the observation of Rosenm.: “Totus locus agit de hominum similitudine cum Deo, ea parte, ut et homines fugiant vitia et sint sancti. Non excluditur tamen veri et boni cognatio.”

6. ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, “live in ignorance and vice.” Οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀληθείαν Carpzov well renders: “non exercemus veritatem, non agimus sincerè et integrè;” as Joh. 3, 21., where see the note.

7. ἐὰν δὲ—φωτὶ. This verse is the exact counterpart of the last; and περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is the contrary to περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ σκότει. Ὡς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, “and strive to imitate his perfections.” Κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ’ ἀλλήλων, “we hold common fellowship,” viz. by mutual love, having the idem velle and the idem nolle, &c. Καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—ἀμαρτίας, “Then the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all former sin.” By αἷμα is meant the sacrifice of the death of Christ; as Heb. 9, 18. The efficacy

of atonement, however, is *conditional*; and the sins here meant must be sins of infirmity and frailty, heartily repented of and entirely forsaken. Carpzov supplies *ἐν περιστάτῳ*, “which yet besets us;” referring to Heb. 12, 1. But this is too arbitrary a sub-audition.

8, 9. *ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι—ἡμῖν*. By *ἁμαρτία* is meant sin in any way, whether through ignorance, or knowingly and habitually. Now those are said to deny that they have sinned, who deny that they have *incurred blame* by sin, and so either excuse or palliate what they have done, and dissemble the fault. So at Jer. 2, 25. the phrases *non peccare*, and *nullam commiseri poenam* are interchanged. Here, then, are designated persons who neither grieve at the sins committed by them, nor ask pardon for them, nor intend amendment of life. *Ἐαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν*, “we impose upon (and injure) ourselves; and truth and religion have no place in our hearts.” (Rosenm.)

Πιστὸς, veracious, true to his promises. *Δίκαιος*, merciful, good. Rosenm. paraphrases: “*Si confiteamur peccata nostra, Deus pro suâ veracitate et benignitate nobis peccata remittit, omnemque culpam tollit.*” See Benson ap. Slade.

10. Here is a repetition, in other words, of what was said at ver. 8.; a manner of further enforcing any important truth frequent with St. John. *Ψεύστην ποιοῦμεν αὐτὸν*. This is well rendered, by Pisc., “*mendacitatis eum arguimus*,” but still closer by Grot., *mendacem facere* (as Job 24, 25.), *aliquem pro mendaci habere*, to account him for a liar, or so to act as if we did. And Grot. compares Heb. 6, 6., “*crucify the Lord afresh.*” The words following are exegetical, and well explained, by Carpzov, “we do not believe and obey his doctrine,” literally, “his *word* has no place in our hearts,” namely, either for belief, or (as consequent upon it) obedience. By the *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* is meant the revelation of God in

the Gospel ; as Joh. 5, 38. 8, 37. Carpz. compares James 1, 21. *δέξασθαι τὸν ἐμφυτὸν λόγον*. See Mackn. and Rosenm.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. *ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν*, "These things am I writing to you." For, as Rosenm. observes, it regards as well what follows, as what precedes. *ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρτητε*, "to caution you against sin, by showing you that all wilful and habitual sin is utterly inconsistent with Divine communion." *Καὶ ἐὰν ἀμάρτη,* "If, however, any do sin," i. e. as Carpzov explains, through frailty, ignorance, or precipitancy—he need not despair of pardon, for in *that* case, &c. *Παρακλήτον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. By *παρακλ.* is meant an *advocate*, one who will plead our cause, a *deprecator*, and, in a general way, a *helper*. Of which sense many examples are adduced by Loesner from Philo ; as 560 D., where Joseph. says to his brethren *μηδένοσ ἐτέρου δεῖσθε παρακλήτου*. Of this forensic and aulick term I have before treated. See the note on Joh. 14. 10., and Elmsley on Eurip. Med. 155. "There is nothing (Doddr. observes) that illustrates the matter more than the residence of some eminent persons from distant provinces in the courts of great princes, or states, whose business it was constantly to negotiate with them the affairs of those whom they represented, to vindicate them from any unjust aspersions, and to promote their interests to the utmost of their power." "Now, as in common life (observes Rosenm.), any one who has found a friend to help him forward, does therefore the more confidently look for success ; so we, when filled with compunction for sin, so much the more confidently trust for pardon, in reliance on Jesus, who is the *ἱλασμός περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν*.

Δικαῖον, sinless ; as 1 Pet. 3, 18. Heb. 7, 26.

2. *καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι*, &c. The *καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστι*

is for ὅς ἐστι; and ἱλασµὸς is for ἱλαστῆς; by a metonymy of the effect, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) *sacrificium pro reatu*; as Ez. 44, 27. Ps. 49, 8. See the excellent note of Whitby, or the extract in Slade.

By the ἡµῶν many recent Commentators understand *Christians* in general; and by ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, the whole human race, of course including Heathens. And (as observes Doddr.) “Christianity could surely receive no prejudice by supposing that truly *virtuous* Heathens may be accepted by God, in consideration of the atonement which Christ has made.” This, however, seems not to have been here had in view; for the Apostle (as many eminent Commentators, antient and modern, suppose,) appears to be only speaking of *believers*; by the ἡµῶν meaning the Jewish people; and by the ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, all the Gentiles who believe and embrace the truth. See Pole’s Syn. and Bens. Wolf, indeed, and almost all the Dutch Commentators take the ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου to mean the whole human race; but then they understand only such as may be *Christians*. See the notes in D’Oyley and Mant.

3. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν—τηρῶμεν, “And by this we know (or may know) that we have a right knowledge of Him (i. e. Christ), if we keep his commandments.” The ἐγνώκαμεν some explain of real knowledge, not speculative and sterile, but practical and useful. Others, observing “*verba notitiæ sæpe affectum denotant*,” explain it *love*; comparing the Heb. ידע and Joh. 10, 14. (See Carpzov.) It is, moreover, not agreed whether by αὐτὸν be meant Christ, or God the Father. Those who adopt the *former* interpretation urge that Christ was just before mentioned. But the same will hold good of the *Father*; and the *latter* is supported by ver. 5. It is at ver. 6. (as Carpzov observes) that Christ, and faith in him, is spoken of. Γινώσκειν αὐτὸν must then be interpreted according to the person understood by αὐτὸν. The term may, in a general way, import to

have a right knowledge of his will, &c. In ver. 4. there is a repetition of the sentiment, *supra*, 1, 8.

5. ὁς δ' αὖν τηρῇ—τετελείωται. By the λόγον is meant (as Rosenm. observes) the preceptive part of Christianity. Ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται. The best Commentators, as Whitby, Carpzov, and Rosenm., are agreed that the sense is: “In him, truly, a sincere love towards God is evinced. In this sense *τελ.* is used at 2 Cor. 12, 9. “Now the precepts of Christ (annotates Rosenm.) express the will of God. No one can more strongly evince his love towards God than by wholly accommodating himself to his will.”

5. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκμεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμεν. The same sentiment in other words: for (as Rosenm. observes) to *be in* God, to *have* God, to be *conjoined with* God. are all synonymous phrases, denoting that conjunction with God mentioned at 1, 3.

6. ὁ λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ—περιπατεῖν. On the phrase μένειν ἐν Χριστῷ see ver. 5. By περιπατεῖν is here, as often, meant *life* and *habitual conduct*. The sentiment is, that consistent disciples imitate their master. Οὕτως is omitted in one MS., the Vulg., and some Latin Fathers. But that may be accounted for from the particle being, in Latin, superfluous. Here (Bens. observes) the Apostle sums up all he had said at ver. 3. and 4, 5.

7, 8. ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐντολὴν—ἀρχῆς, “Brethren, I enjoin no new commandment upon you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning.”

Such is (I conceive) the sense of the words: but on what is meant by the ἐντολὴν παλαιάν there is much diversity of opinion. Some, as Hamm., Carpzov, and Rosenm., refer it to what was said at ver. 6. on the imitating Christ, and abstaining from vice. And Rosenm. thinks this is levelled against the false teachers, who disseminated new doctrines, and did not follow those of Christ, but propounded fancies of their own. The ἐντολή he would take for the *complexus plurimus præceptorum*, the principal doctrines of Christianity; as 2 Pet. 2, 11. 3, 2. Heb. 7, 18. 19, 19. And he lays down the following as the general sense: “Religionis doctrinæ, quas ego vobis trado, de necessitate peccata fugiendi et sanctè vivendi, non sunt novæ, sed jam ab initio Evangelii omnibus cognitæ.” But in

this there is something strained and harsh. Mackn. proposes a new, but most far-fetched interpretation. The most eminent Commentators, from Bp. Bull to Benson and Bp. Horsley, refer the subject matter of ver. 7, 8. to that of 9—11., namely, that Christians should love each other even as Christ had loved them. Now this was an early injunction of Christ, and had been all along inculcated by the Apostles and true teachers; the contrary to which was a recent innovation of false ones. It was, indeed, as old as the Mosaic law; but, on the other hand (for that is the sense of *πάλιν*) certain considerations entitled it to the appellation of *νέω*, both as regarded Christ and themselves (*ὁ ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν*). See the paraphrase of Benson and his note, and the excellent paraphrase of Doddr., as also Bp. Horsley's Sermon on Joh. 13, 34., or the extract in Slade, and the notes of Bp. Hall and Abp. Secker ap. D'Oyley and Mant.

The words *ὅτι ἡ σκοτία παράγεται, καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη φαίνει* are obscure and variously interpreted. I would translate: "For the darkness is passing away, and the true light now shineth." The connection seems to be this: "And your obligations to fulfil such a command are proportionably greater, for the darkness is more and more dispelled, and," &c.

9. *ὁ λέγων—ἄρτι*. By *ἀδελφ.* is meant *fellow-creature*. See Matt. 5, 44. *Ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστίν*, "is yet in the darkness of ignorance, and has no true knowledge of religion." In this ignorance *sin* also seems implied. The *ἔως ἄρτι* refers to the light having shone on the world. It is truly remarked, by Rosenm., that to *many* this might seem a new doctrine; and the misanthropic spirit of the Jews is well known.

10, 11. *ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει, καὶ σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστίν*. *Μένει* seems to be for *ἐμμένει*; and it is a sort of *vox prægnans*, well explained by Rosenm.: "*eo ipso declarat et ostendit se constantem esse*," &c. By *φωτὶ* is meant the true religion, and the duties it enjoins. It is then added: *καὶ σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστίν*, which words are variously explained. Benson takes the *αὐτῷ* to refer to *φωτὶ*; and he renders: "there is no danger of his stumbling in *that*." This he supports with his usual ingenuity: but it is not without reason that almost every other Commentator takes it to refer to the *person*. Rosenm. paraphrases thus: "*in eo nullum obstaculum (virtutis) est; nihil est quod eum impediat, quo minus nempe in cognitione veri et virtutis studio crescere possit.*"

Our affections and lusts (he adds) lay stumbling-blocks for our virtue; whereas in his heart who has true Christian love, the baleful passions of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, find no place.

The words of the antithetical clause $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\ \mu\iota\sigma\omega\acute{\nu}$ — $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Rosenm. rightly remarks, are not to be rigorously interpreted. His exposition, however, is somewhat vague. The sense (I conceive) is: "Such a man shows that he is involved in the grossest ignorance of true religion, its essence, and duties; and as far as he is a professor of Christianity, and aims at salvation, he entirely wanders both in conception and action from the object he seeks; and, like the blind Sodomites, vainly wearies himself to find the door of salvation."

12. With the portion consisting of this and the three following verses Commentators have been not a little perplexed; and most of them stumble at what they please to call the *tautology*, on account of which much ambiguity is supposed to exist in several of the expressions. Many, Mr. Slade says, with reason, "adopt the conjecture of Doddr., and suppose, from the great similarity of expressions, that some were corrections of others; and that, by mistake, all of them, original as well as corrected, were received into the text." And he adds, that there does appear, altogether, from MSS. and Versions, "no small uncertainty respecting the true reading. A consistent interpretation (he thinks) of the passage might be obtained, by omitting the two first clauses of ver. 13. as far as $\tau\omicron\acute{\nu}\nu\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\rho\omicron\acute{\nu}\nu$, and by beginning it with $\epsilon\grave{\gamma}\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\alpha\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha$, instead of $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$, which reading is supported by some of the best authorities, and it will agree with what follows." He observes, too, that this construction is supported by the context. (See more in his note.) But to all this I must demur. Neither conjectures nor transpositions (especially when, as in the present case, they are unsupported by authority,) have, in the course of this work, received much attention from me, nor do they seem entitled to it. And as to *tautology*, the notions of the antients and the moderns differ exceedingly on this point, the latter of whom have a *fastidiousness* thereon quite unknown to the former. Now *repetitions* abound in the Apostle, and what are called *tautologies* are not rare. But these (I conceive) are seldom introduced, except for the purpose of *enforcing* some precept, &c.; and such seems to be the case *here*, as I shall show in the annotations, in the course of which the ambiguities and difficulties complained of by Slade will (I trust) be removed. And, first, much obscurity is removed from the passage by the view of the whole traced out by Carpzov, whom see in loco. He takes the *primary pro-*

position and thesis to be contained in ver. 15. *μη ἀγαπάτε τὸν κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν κόσμῳ*, which he prints in capitals. Rosenm., (who entirely adopts his view,) observes, that certainly “the repeated verbs γράψω, ἔγραψα, and also the repeated nouns *τεκνία, πατέρες, and νεανίσκοι*, are the same impelling causes insisted on anew. It is plain, then, that the sentence is continued, and no full stop must be placed, except after *κόσμῳ*.”

Τεκνία. The best Commentators are pretty much agreed that this is a *general address*, comprising all Christians, as at ver. 1., and frequently elsewhere in St. John. (See Beza and Wolf.) The words *ὅτι ἀφ᾽ ὧνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* are supposed, by Rosenm., to contain a *reason* why Christians ought not to prefer the world (ver. 15.); namely, since the forgiveness of sins should always be an incentive to the striving after holiness, and especially the cultivation of mutual love.

13. *γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς*, “I write to you, fathers, for ye know him that is from the beginning.” Mr. Slade (rightly I think) supposes that the use of the word *τεκνία* suggested to the Apostle the idea of addressing himself to the three gradations of Christians denominated by *children, young men, and fathers*. And he cites Schol. ap. Matth. Here, however, we are encountered with diversity of opinions. Many Commentators suppose that this is meant for a distribution of Christians into the different degrees of spiritual progress. But there is hardly any thing to countenance the notion. There seems scarcely more than an *allusion* to the different degrees of proficiency which might be presumed in those different ages; and Rosenm. thinks these are introduced *oratoricè*: adding: “Solent nempe qui ad alios verba faciunt sæpe singulorum ordinum, singularumque ætatum homines alloqui, non quodd hæc vel illa admonitio ad unius conditionis homines pertineat, sed ut declarent, se omnibus ac singulis aliquid dicere posse.” In this, however, there is something rather too artificial to suit the plainness and simplicity of the Apostle’s style. On the distribution of the three ages which constitute the term of life, he might have observed, that such was not unusual to the antients. So Thucyd. 6, 18. (Γ. 2, 354, 6. Bekker.) *καὶ νομίσατε νεότητα μὲν καὶ γῆρας ἄνευ ἀλλήλων μηδὲν δύνασθαι, ὁμοῦ δὲ τὸ τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀκριβὲς ἂν ἐγκραθὲν μάλιστ’ ἂν ἰσχύειν*. Æschyl. Sept. Theb. 10. *Ἵμῶς δὲ χρὴ νῦν, καὶ τὸν ἐλλείποντ’ ἔτι Ἡβῆς ἀκμαίας, καὶ τὸν ἐξηβον χρόνῳ, Βλαστημὸν ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πολὺν, ὦραν τ’ ἔχονθ’ ἑκάστον*. & 660. *Ἄλλ’ οὔτε νιν φνύγοντα μητρόθεν σκότον, Οὔτ’ ἐν τροφαῖσιν, οὔτ’ ἐφηβήσαντά πω, Οὔτ’ ἐν γενεῖον ξυλλογῇ τριχώματος*, to omit many other passages which I shall adduce on the passage of Thucydides.

The words *ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς* are very remarkable: for the best Commentators are agreed that the expression cannot mean *God*, but *Jesus Christ* (since, as Rosenm. observes, He is in this portion plainly distinguished from Him), and denotes his eternal being with God the Father. Rosenm. aptly compares Joh. 1, 1. *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*, I add Theophyl. Sim. 115 c, *ἐπετιμησε γὰρ τοῖς ἐθνέσιν ὁ ὢν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς*.

The *application* is obvious: that they will not prefer to this eternal Being things temporal and speedily to perish, ver. 17. See Rosenm.

The νεανισκοὶ are persons in the flower of life. And the νεκρῆ-κατε τὸν πονηρόν alludes to those fiery temptations of Satan (" darts tempered in hell"), or carnal temptations, which he levels *particularly* against such. For as the knowledge of Christ is *presumed* to be most in the aged, so carnal temptation, and, as it is to be hoped, effectual resistance thereto, is to be expected from those in the flower of age.

By the παῖδια are evidently meant the youths, or striplings. See Benson.

14. ἐγραψα ὑμῖν—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. The repetition has peculiar energy: and Rosenm. well translates: " Tenete, quæso, senes, quod scripserim, vos cognovisse," &c. And he remarks, that they are enjoined to bear in mind by what means they have arrived at that happy state, and to always strive after further degrees of perfection.

"Οτι ἰσχυροί ἐστε—πονηρόν. There is no need to resort to the *metathesis* here supposed by Rosenm. The words may be rendered: " For you (I presume) are strong (in the Lord), and the word and revelation of God abideth in you, and (I trust that) you have exerted your strength and conquered the evil one."

15. μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Now comes the weighty admonition so long suspended on the construction. Here the Apostle cautions Christians against the love of this world, and (as Bens. observes) enforces the caution with three arguments. 1st. The love of God and the love of the world are inconsistent. 2dly. This world will soon pass away. 3dly. The rewards of sincere piety will be eternal.

The κόσμον is, by most Commentators, explained the evil part of the world. (See Pole.) But I rather apprehend that the *limitation* (for such must be supposed) is to be made at the word ἀγαπᾶτε, and that this signifies this excessive degree of attachment which it is never safe to devote even to the most legitimate objects of regard, and the most important business of the world, otherwise it will clash with the love towards God, (with which Pric. compares the *religio patris*,) and eventually destroy it. The above view (I find) is supported by Bens. and Doddr. See the excellent note of the former.

16. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν κόσμῳ—ἐστι. These words contain the *reason*; and the Apostle here contemplates the case when the affections (as it too often happens) are absorbed and diverted from their proper object, not by the legitimate and laudable objects of the world, but such as are altogether carnal and at variance with our high calling in Christ Jesus.

It is evident from the words following that πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ must denote " whatever disposition of mind is (centered) in the world," which implies an *excessive attachment* to it. Of this the Apostle gives three examples; the ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς, the ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, and the ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, which are supposed

to be meant for the three different stages of life above mentioned; and it is generally thought that young men are cautioned against the *lusts of the flesh*, old men against *covetousness*, and children against the *pride of life*. Bens. however, supposes that the youth were cautioned against indulging the lusts of the flesh, young men or middle-aged persons against the pride of life or ambition, and old men against covetousness. And in like manner Wolf and Doddr. explain the *ἀλαζονεία*. Yet in these criticisms there is something precarious; and any such application of the three terms seems too formal for the simplicity of the Apostle's style. I rather imagine that a caution is here intended against the most formidable temptations that beset persons of every age. The *ἐπιθυμία* evidently signifies *sensual excess of every kind*. The *ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν* is by some applied to *lasciviousness*; as Matt. 5, 28. 2 Pet. 1, 14. where see the notes. And this I can myself confirm from Philostr. V. Ap. 1, 42. τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν, ὅπερ εἰσάγονται διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. 6, 11. βρώσεως τε καθαρώ, ἡμέρου τε ὡς φοιτᾷ δι' ὀμμάτων. Hesch. III. p. 53 ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἢ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἔρχεται. Æschyl. Agam. 718. seqq. μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος Δηξιθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος Παρακλίνουσ'. Eurip. Hippol. 527. Monk. Ἔρως, Ἔρως, ὁ κατ' ὀμμάτων Στάζεις παῖθον, &c. Others interpret it of *covetousness*; which may be plausibly maintained (see the learned note of Carp.); but it is best to take the expression in its most extensive sense, to denote a desire for the gay vanities, the external *gaudes* (as they are called by our old writers,) of this world. This interpretation is confirmed by Ezek. 24, 25. λαμβάνω τὴν ἑπαρσιν τῆς καυχίσεως αὐτῶν, τὰ ἐπιθυμήματα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. As to the *ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου*, it is chiefly exegetical of the preceding; or may have, as Rosenm. thinks, especial allusion to the ostentatious vanities of dress, and (he might have added) all such other kinds of ostentation as the rich delight in. It is not ill rendered by Tindale the *pryde of goodes*. It is best expressed by our old word *braveries*, i. e. the ostentations, pomps, and splendours of this world.

Now these, the Apostle adds, are not *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) are not agreeable to the will of the Father; and (as Mr. Slade observes) he shows us, that though God, as our Creator, is the author of our natural appetites, the abuse of them "is of the world."

17. καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ. Hi pereunt, et perit id, quo delectantur, morte finem imponente omnibus mundanis desideriiis. Caduca omnia, et citò transeuntia. (Rosenm.) The *παράγεται* seems to denote the gradual perishing of all these things, which, as it were, fade from our eyes. I would compare 1 Cor. 7, 31. παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, where see the note. Ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. By μένει εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα is (I conceive) not meant, as Rosenm. explains,

“he shall never cease to practise virtue, and find its reward,” but simply, he shall have an eternity of life and happiness; the objects of *his* love and attachment will continue for ever, and will not, as in the case of the sensual and worldly minded, leave him even *before* he leaves *them*.”

18. From hence to ver. 28. the Apostle cautions the Christians against those deceivers who then appeared in great numbers: and points out to them the many advantages which they had for knowing the truth; and the many obligations which they were under to adhere to it, and to practise accordingly. (Bens.)

18. ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. On the sense of this expression Commentators are by no means agreed. Rosenm. enumerates five principal various interpretations. 1. “the last age of the world. But this cannot be admitted, since the Apostle is speaking of what is shortly to happen. 2. “The time near unto the destruction of Jerusalem.” But neither can that be intended, if, as some say, the Epistle was written in the name of Domitian. 3. “Perilous and evil times.” 4. “The future or coming period,” (from the Hebr. בְּאַתְרֵיט חַמִּים), alluding to some prophecy then well known. Knapp thinks the Apostle has reference to the predictions of Christ respecting some future false prophets (i. e. teachers feigning divine inspiration), Matt. 7, 15. 24, 11 and 24. Mark 13, 22 and 23. “Now (continues he) the perversity of many teachers in this age did seem to *point* at the fulfilment of the predictions. In the present evils the Apostle saw a prelude to future and more serious ones, although of the exact time when these should happen he knew not. See Acts 26, 29 and 30. 1 Tim. 4, 1. 2 Tim. 3, 1 seq. 4, 5. 2 Thess. 2, 3—12. 2 Pet. 3, 20. Jude 17 and 18.” A highly ingenious, but (I think) somewhat too artificial an interpretation. As to the *fourth*, it has very little to recommend it. The *third*, which is supported by Schoettg., Wolf, and Rosenm., seems to deserve the preference.

18. καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι ὁ ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται—ὧρα ἐστίν. On the subject of the ἀντίχριστος there is as little agreement of opinion as on the ἐσχάτη ὥρα. (See Pole's Syn. and Wolf.) It is observed by Rosenm. and Slade that the ἀντι. may signify *in the place of*, or *in opposition to*. And some suppose that the Apostle means the impostors who (as we find from Josephus), after the destruction of Jerusalem, rose up, and pretended to be the Messiah. But the points of similarity are fewer than those of dissimilarity. The *latter* sense, therefore, of ἀντι. must be adopted: and the best founded opinion seems to be that of most early Commentators, and recently Benson, Doddr., Rosenm., &c., that the Apostle means false teachers, whose life and doctrine were in opposition to Christ and his religion; and the term is supposed to be synonymous with the ὁ ἀντικείμενος of St. Paul at 2 Thess. 2, 4. From the description St. John gives of these men further on, and at 4, 3. and 2 Eph. 7., it appears that they were *not* (as Whitby supposes) unbelieving Jews, persons who pretended to be Christians, and yet maintained that Jesus was not the Messiah; or, if the Messiah, in some peculiar sense of their own. Others say they were *apostates*. And all the classes of early heretics are fixed upon by some one or other of the Commentators. (See Carpz.) Upon the whole, no certainty can be attained, for want of more information on the religious state of those times. See Bp. Bull's *Judicium Ecclesiæ*, p. 33, 38. and Vitring. *Obs. Sacr.* L. 5. c. 12.

19. ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον—ἡμῶν. The antithesis is very pointed, but can scarcely be expressed in any other language. The ἐξῆλθον is perhaps a vox prægnans. And the sense seems to be this: "They went forth from us, and therefore had arisen from us; but they were never really *of* us, not Christians in heart, but who, after having become such, imbibed false notions, and threw the society into confusion."

19. εἰ γὰρ—μεθ ἡμῶν. The Apostle proves their

former falseness from their subsequent apostacy. In the next words ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσι πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν there is an ellipsis, which some supply by, *this was permitted by God*. But that is too arbitrary a subaudition. It is plain that ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξήλθον must be supplied from the former part of the verse (and so the Syr. and E. V.); though the former may be included in a *secondary* sense.

The words ὅτι οὐκ εἰσι πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν admit of two renderings. E. V. &c. “that they were not all of us.” But that cannot be the sense. They must rather (by a sort of Hebraism, as v. 21. πᾶν ψεῦδος—ἐστι) be for ὅτι πάντες εἰσι οὐκ ἐξ ἡμῶν, “that they were not any of them of us. Εἰσι for ἦσαν, as often. Rosenm. assigns the sense, “that not all those who are in our societies are Christians at heart.” But this the φανερωθῶσιν will not permit; and at ὅτι οὐκ—there would be a very harsh ellipsis.

20. καὶ ὑμεῖς χάρισμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, “ye are anointed,” &c. Now *anointing*, according to Oriental manners, is supposed to accompany inauguration to any office of dignity. This anointing may be considered as alluding to our Christian inauguration by the sacraments and the preaching of the word. From a comparison of ver. 24 and 27. it appears that this unction or anointing denotes the *first instruction in the Christian religion*, the fruit of which is a knowledge of the truth (ver. 20, 21 and 27). Since, then, the thing is sufficiently shown by the writer himself, we must not attend to those who maintain a different sort of unction. (Rosenm.) There may, however, be an *allusion* to the imparting of the χαρίσματα of the Holy Spirit, then so frequent. See the note on 2 Cor. 1, 22. and Mackn. in loco. Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου may either mean *God*, or *Jesus Christ*; though the *latter* interpretation is the more probable. See Beza, Grot., Whitby, Wells, Doddr., and Mackn., or the extracts in Slade. Καὶ οἶδατε πάντα. The πάντα must (as Grot. observes) be restricted by the subject matter (as in 1 Cor. 9, 22. 15, 27.), and denote all

things necessary to salvation, and to avoid the delusions of those impostors, viz. (as Rosenm. observes) that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world (Joh. 18, 36.), that we are to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, &c. (Matt. 22, 21.), that the jus gladii is not to be seized, by taking the law into our own hands.

21. οὐκ ἔγραψα—οἴδατε αὐτήν. Rosenm. takes the οὐκ ἔγραψα for, “non ea mihi scribendi fuit causa.” But this is too harsh a subaudition. It is more natural, with Carpz., to take ὅτι in the sense *quasi*, i. e. “(supposing) that.” And the words ἀλλ’ ὅτι—ἔστι require a similar subaudition. Thus: “but as supposing, or trusting, that ye know it.” For, as Bens. observes, even persons in possession of knowledge, nay, endowed with the Spiritual gifts, stood in need of repeated cautions and admonitions. He might have compared a kindred passage of 2 Pet. 1, 22. Διὸ οὐκ ἀμελήσω ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, καί—περ εἰδότες καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείας.

21. ὅτι πᾶν ψεῦδος. Here is a common Hebraism, by which πᾶν with an οὐκ following stands for a *negatio universalis*. The sense is well expressed by Benson thus: “and are sensible that no false doctrine proceeds from the truth, or is consistent with it.” By the *truth* is meant the *pure* Gospel; and by the ψεῦδος, the erroneous doctrines of the Antichrists.

22. τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ψεύστης—Χριστός; This is. (as Rosenm. says) to be taken *comparatè*; since there are other kinds of impostors. “Who is an impostor, if he be not?” i. e. who is so great an impostor as he who denies that Jesus is the Messiah? Ἀρνεῖσθαι and many such verbs take a negative after them, which, not being expressed in other languages, is thought a pleonasm, but it tends, as in the case of two negatives, to strengthen the negation.

22. οὗτός ἐστιν—οἶδν. Rosenm. observes, that ἀρνεῖσθαι here signifies to detract from the faith and authority of; as Acts 3, 13 and 14. And it is truly re-

marked by Whitby and Rosenm., that ἀρν. τὸν Πατέρα does not signify to deny the existence of God, and so be an Atheist, but (as Whitby says) to deny, 1. the truth of his *testimony*, c. 5, 10. Joh. 3, 33.; 2. the *doctrine* of the Father, or that doctrine which proceedeth from him; for “he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God.” Joh. 3, 24. “Whence it is evident (continues Whitby) that he who denieth the Son, cannot retain the true knowledge of the Father, because he can be known only through the Son. Joh. 1, 18. 4, 23 and 24. 8, 19 and 55. 14, 6 and 7. 16, 3. Matt. 11, 27.” Or it may signify (as Morus explains) to deny that the Father sent the Son for the salvation of men, to deny the Father’s benefits, as conferred on men by Jesus Christ.” So also Rosenm. and Wets.

23. πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν Υἱόν, οὐδὲ τὸν Πατέρα ἔχει, “He who denieth honour to the Son, hath not the Father in honour or in knowledge, receives not his doctrine.” It is observed by Rosenm., that ἔχειν Θεόν, and κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετὰ Θεοῦ, as also εἶναι ἐν Θεῷ, are in this Epistle interchanged, and denote all the unity and *relationship* with God effected by religion. See also Bens. The words ὁ ὁμολογῶν—ἔχει, found in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and received by Griesb., Matt., Knapp, and Vater, have the appearance of being genuine; for they not only seem to be required by the sense, but they savour of the style of St. John; and their omission may better be imputed to homæoteleuton than their addition to a marginal scholium.

24, 25. ὑμεῖς οὖν—μενέτω. Ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, “from the commencement of your evangelization.” Grot. remarks, that the construction is κατὰ τὸ σημαίνόμενον; as at ver. 27; for the Apostle begins as if to say: “Ye then, what ye have heard from the beginning, retain;” but for the *retain* he puts, “let it remain in you.”

24. ἐὰν ἐν ὑμῖν μένῃ—μενεῖτε. Now, *remaining* in implies *favour*, and the receiving the promises of

God by the Son. The promise of the Father, i. e. the thing promised by the Father, is then said to be eternal life and happiness. The accusative is put for the nominative, like the well known *urbem quem statuo vestra est*. See, however, Bens. or Slade.

26. ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς. The *περὶ* some render *on account of*; as Matt. 4, 6. Most assign to it the sense *concerning*. If it be rendered *quod attinet ad*, the former signification may be included. Πλανώντων may signify those who are seducing them, which imports the *endeavour*, whether successful or not. See Bens., Wells, and Doddr.

27. καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ χάρισμα ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὑμῖν μένει. The *καὶ ὑμεῖς* is rightly taken by Rosenm. for *ad quod attinet*; the *ὑμεῖς* being put *absolutely*. On *χάρισμα* see the note *supra*, ver. 20. The words *καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε ἵνα τις διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς*, however, are somewhat obscure. They seem to express that the persons he is addressing stand in need of no admonition to maintain a virtuous course: and Carpz. remarks that the *τις* (according to the usage of the Apostle) denotes *himself*. But the words cannot have such a meaning; otherwise why *did* the Apostle admonish them. Either, therefore, the expressions must be understood with restriction (as they are by Grot.) to time, places, and circumstances (on which see the excellent note of Doddr.), or import that they had no need of information for the purpose of distinguishing false teachers from true ones; for many had the *gift* of discerning spirits. See 1 Cor. 12, 10. and the note. (Consult Mackn. and Slade.) Or, with Bens. and Rosenm., we may suppose the *τις* to relate to any of those impostors; or at *διδάσκῃ* understand *τι*, i. e. “any thing those impostors could teach you.” But this is not so natural a mode of interpretation.

27. ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χάρισμα—μενεῖτε ἐν αὐτῷ. Καὶ, and so. Ψεῦδος is for *ψευδὲς*; and (as Rosenm. observes) the same thing is said first affirmatively, and then by denying the opposite. The *μενεῖτε* is by

some considered as the future for the imperative. But *that* comes in the next verse. It seems better, with Grot., Bens., and Rosenm., to take it for a future *bene sperantis et ominantis*; “ye will (I trust) remain in him, and continue in his doctrine.”

28. καὶ νῦν, τέκνιά, μένετε—παρουσία αὐτοῦ. The sense (I conceive) is this: “And now, my children, (to my hope and trust let me add my *injunction*,) abide (I say) in him, that when he shall appear, we (i. e. not only ye, but *myself*,) may have confidence, and not have cause to blush and be confounded at his presence, when he cometh.” In the change of persons we may observe great delicacy; for the rejection and disgrace of the disciple tends to the discredit of the teacher. See 1 Thess. 2, 19 and 20. Hebr. 13, 17., &c. The καὶ νῦν is (as Carpz. observes) a formula used in exhortation deduced from premises, and may be rendered *proinde*. See also Slade. Αἰσχύνεσθαι ἀπὸ τινος is compared with the Hebrew בושׁ ב. So we say to *blush at*. Now such blushing implies *rejection*.

29. εἰάν εἰδῆτε—γεγέννηται. With these words Bens. makes a new section commence. Δίκαιος, *virtuous*. Γινώσκετε may be taken either for an indicative or imperative. Ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην (as usual in St. John,) imports an habitual practice of virtue. Ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται, “is his genuine son, is acknowledged as such, and beloved.” In this *sonship* is implied both a similarity with God, of feeling, thinking, and acting, and the favour and benefits usually imparted by fathers to sons. On the expression see more in Mackn., or Slade. The transition from Christ to God is compared by Rosenm. with that at ver. 3, 5, and 16. from God to Christ.

CHAP. III.

St. John represents it as the honour and privilege of the disciples of Christ, that they are the *sons of*

God, and entitled to future happiness. But, withal, he lets them know, that the way to prepare for that future felicity is, by purity of heart and life; that the practice of righteousness is the only sure proof that we are born of God, and are true Christians; as vice is an unquestionable proof of a man's belonging to the wicked one. (Bens.)

VER. 1. Ἰδετε ποταπὴν—κληθῶμεν. Nova excitatur attentio; sed cohæret oratio cum superioribus. (Rosenm.) Ἰδετε, *reflect, consider*. Ποταπὴν ἀγάπην, “what an amazing proof of love.” Ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶμεν. The καὶ ἐσμεν added in many MSS. and Versions is from the margin. The Apostle has reference to the name applied to Christians by Christ himself, Matt. 5, 45. On the import of the term see the note supra, 2, 29. It appears (Slade says) from the preceding verse, that the Apostle alludes to those who actually were the sons of God, “by doing righteousness.”

1. διὰ τοῦτο—αὐτόν. Benson observes, that the two members of this argument are transposed;—*Because the world knew him not, therefore it knows not us*. Or the truth is first laid down, and then the reason of it assigned. He adds that, when it is said the world *knew them not*, it is meant, did not fully comprehend what glory and felicity was implied in being sons of God, and heirs of the eternal inheritance, and this for the same reason, that they knew not God (or Christ) and his doctrine, being blind in heavenly things.”

2. νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν—ἐστί. Here we have a solemn repetition of the same assertion, another truth being engrafted upon it with respect to our dignity and glory in the future world. I would paraphrase thus: “(As to our present state) *now* (I repeat) we are already sons of God, and (as to our future one) it does not yet appear what we shall be. However, this we do know, that when he shall appear we shall be *like* unto him, for we shall see him as he is.” On the τέκνα see the note on 2, 29. Οὕτω ἐφανερώθη, “it

does not yet appear even to true Christians (much less to the profane *world*; they cannot form any accurate conceptions).” *Τί ἐσόμεθα*, “in what state or situation we shall be placed, and what called, what dignity,” &c. ; for *τι* is a very extensive term, and is (as Rosenm. observes) applied to all *qualities*. The *οἶδαμεν* Carpz. and Rosenm. treat as an expression frequent in St. John, equivalent to *sanè, certissimè*. And they might have compared the *οἶδα ὅτι*, and *εὖ οἶδ’ ὅτι* of Thucyd. and the Attics. But this seems a needless refinement. At *ἐὰν φανερωθῇ* the best Critics, as Grot., Carpz., and Rosenm. take *ἐὰν* for *ὅταν*. But it is more correct to say that *ὅτι ἐὰν* is for *ὅταν*. See several examples in Benson, and Whitby. It remains, however, matter of enquiry, what is the nominative to *φανερωθῇ*. Perhaps *Θεός*, or rather, as Beza, Vorst., Menoch., Gomar, and most Commentators suppose, *Χριστός*. To this, however, objections are made by Bens. Yet *ἐφανερώθη* occurs in this very sense at ver. 5. He and Tindall, Grot., Carpz., Rosenm., and Jaspis think that *τι ἐσόμεθα* must be repeated, “what shall be our then state and dignity,” (which, however, as Slade observes, comes to the same thing,) i. e. (explains Rosenm.) not in goodness only, but in eternity and blessedness; no longer liable to sin and death, our knowledge and love of virtue consummate.

2. *ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστι*, i. e. not *ἐν αἰνίγματι*, but *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*, as says St. Paul, 1 Cor., 13, 12.; and hence will arise felicity the most complete. The Commentators enlarge much further: but they seem to forget the words just before, *οὕτω ἐφανερώθη τι ἐσόμεθα*, which, after all human speculations have been carried the furthest, will remain true.

The *ὅτι* signifies *siquidem*, and the *ὅτι ὁψόμεθα*, is meant to show *why* we shall be like unto him.

3. *καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἔχων—ἀγνός ἐστι*. *Τὴν ἐλπίδα*, i. e. this hope of participation in felicity with God and Christ, and of greater resemblance to their holiness.

Ἀγνίξει. This is one of those verbs which imply *endeavour*, i. e. “*strives to purify himself.*” Καθὼς is by the best Commentators interpreted not of *purity*, but *similitude* (as Matt. 5, 48.), i. e. so as to become pure *in like manner*, though not in the same *degree*, as He is pure and holy. See the excellent notes of Beza and Whitby.

4. πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ. The best Commentators are agreed that by ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν is meant habitual, wilful, and flagitious sin, moral *contamination*, in opposition to the *purity* just before mentioned. The τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ is equivalent to ἀνομεῖ, i. e. νόμον παραβαίνει, scil. τοῦ Θεοῦ. And so Rosenm. explains. Carpz., however, understands, by the phrase ποιεῖν ἀνομίαν, “contaminate the doctrines and laws of Christ, and violate his religion.” See the paraphrase of Slade.

5. καὶ οἴδατε—ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι. The Apostle now adduces other reasons why we are to live holily; 1st., Because Christ appeared on the earth for the very purpose of suppressing sin, that men should no longer commit it. (Rosenm.) But, considering how frequent in Scripture is the expression αἵρειν ἁμαρτίαν, always denoting the procuring pardon, by taking away the guilt of sin, and thus atoning for it, I cannot but adopt that sense here; and so Bens., who has an excellent note. Yet the context and course of reasoning seems to require the other, namely, the being freed from the dominion and power of sin (Rom. 6, 6.); a sense supported by Hamm., Whitby, Doddr., Mackn., Rosenm., and others. Perhaps, therefore, it may be best to unite both interpretations; i. e. Jesus Christ appeared on earth, to abolish the tyranny of sin, and suppress all deliberate sin, not merely by purity of doctrine, and holiness of life (as Rosenm. supposes) but by making an atonement for all involuntary and not deliberate, or at least repented of and forsaken sin.

6. πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει. It is plain that ἁμαρτάνειν here, as throughout this Epistle,

denotes habitual or deliberate sin. See Doddr. *Εώρακεν*. This term, like the Hebr. *יָדָע* (from whence it is derived), here signifies *to know*: an idiom found in modern languages, by which corporeal perception stands for mental. The *ἐγνώκεν* seems added exegetically, or to strengthen the sentence, and need not be explained (with Rosenm.) *venerates and loves*. The other phrases of the verse have been before explained. See Bens.

7. *τεκνία, μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς*. There is here (by a phrase found also at Eph. 5, 6., 2 Thess., 2, 3. See also 1 Cor., 3, 18.) an allusion to false teachers, who then (as now) devised other ways of being righteous than that appointed by *God*; though even without such, the heart of every man is too apt to deceive him, by insinuating that a profession of the Christian faith, and a love of virtue, will stand in the place of the performance of the one, and the practice of the other.

The *ποιῶν* must, as before, be understood of habitual virtue in the main course of our lives. For so (as Doddr. observes) it is necessary to interpret the phrase, in order to avoid an indulgence as extravagant as the severity we have just before opposed. Bens. (after Le Clerc.) compares a similar sentiment of Aristot.: “Then shall a man be righteous. 1st., If he does the things which are righteous, and knows what he does. 2dly., If he does them freely, or out of choice. 3dly., If he continues firmly and constantly in that course of action.” To which I add Themist.: *ἐκ τῶν τὰ δίκαια πραττόντων ὁ δίκαιος γίνεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τὰ σώφρονα ὁ σώφρων*. See also Slade.

8. *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν*. The *ποιῶν* must again be understood of *habit*; and there is a brevity (unnoticed, however, by the Commentators) which requires to be thus supplied, and the whole rendered as follows: “He that practises sin (must not say he is a son of *God*; no,) he is (a son) of the Devil (and this son-ship is established by strong similitude); for the Devil has been habitually

and perpetually sinning." It is not necessary to press on the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, which some interpret, "from the beginning of the human race." Rather, "from time he began to sin." It should seem that as the present tense here denotes continuity of action (See Bens.), so the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς may import *perpetuity* of action. The expression, *son of the Devil*, occurs at Joh. 8, 44 & 47., where see the notes.

At the words εἰς τοῦτο—διαβόλου, the argument requires a καίτοι, *and yet*. Indeed, the omission, or peculiar use of the particles, is one of the causes of difficulty in St. John's writings. The *sentiment* is nearly the same as at ver. 5.; but, as for αἴρειν we have λύειν, there is no direct allusion to the *atonement* for sin. Though, as death and misery are consequences of sin, they are the works of the Devil, and, therefore, the atonement of Christ as much destroyed the latter, as his Divine precepts and holy example did the former. See Bens.

9. πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ.

The Commentators have failed to observe that the words πᾶς οὐ ποιεῖ contain nearly the same sentiment as the πᾶς—ἁμαρτάνει; for son-ship and intimate union are cognate ideas. They must therefore have the same sense; and ἁμαρτίαν ποιεῖ must be explained, like ἁμαρτάνει, of deliberate and habitual sin. Here, however, some words are added by way of explanation, to show the πᾶς; and as these words contain an obscure expression, (ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει,) and another of some latitude, (οὐ δύναται,) it is no wonder that they should have been misunderstood. That they *cannot* be meant to assert the doctrines of *perfection*, and the impossibility of the Saints falling away, is (as Benson observes) quite certain from the many exhortations and threatenings of this Epistle (as well as the rest of the New Testament), which show not only the possibility, but the danger of the Saints falling away. That, in point of fact, none are free from sin, is asserted supra, 1, 8. And as the sense of ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ is clearly ascertained from ver. 5., so from thence it will appear what that of οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν is *not*; namely, that it cannot signify absolute impossibility, by the exertion of any external power, for *that* would prevent *every kind* of sin as well as habitual and deliberate sin; indeed deliberation would be out of the question. We must therefore resort to some other mode of interpretation. Δύναται some explain, *will not, does not choose*. But this, though a not unexampled signification, is too vague. It is better, with the most eminent Commentators, from Grot. to Rosen., to take it of *moral impossibility*, i. e. he, as it were, cannot bring

himself to commit such sin, it is foreign from his disposition. And Grot. adduces several Scriptural and Classical examples. See also Wets. This sense, too, of δύνασθαι, is every where recognised by the antient Commentators, and *here*, by Œcumen. And in the same way the expression is understood by Milton, cited by Valpy. Indeed, the idea is quite common in the modern languages. See a kindred passage at 5, 18.

The reason for this is then suggested in the words ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται, i. e. he remembers his affinity to God, and the obligation thence resulting to imitate him.

But we have not touched on the obscure expression ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, which is assigned as a reason why he does not practise sin. The best founded interpretation seems to be that of Grot., adopted by Bens., Rosenm., and most recent Commentators : Quia verbum Dei, quod quasi semen est, quo divina natura in nobis gignitur, in ipso vegetum existit, vel vim suam exserit. *Semen Dei* est verbum Evangelii. Matth. 13, 19., 1 Pet., 1, 23. Jac. 1, 18. Μένειν, hic est inesse, quod intelligendum ἐνεργῶς, ita ut nec arefactum sit, nec suffocatum, sed naturam efficientiamque retineat. Est autem talis argumentatio : Fieri non potest, ut qui filius est Dei, in eo non sit verbum, quod est semen divinum. At verbi vis ea est, ut nos a peccatis arceat jubendo, vetando, pollicendo, comminando. All this is true as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

The vital principle of a holy life committed to our hearts (like a seedling to the ground), consists not only in the word of God, but also the Divine grace by that word is made effectual. Here Carpz. cites the words of Virgil : “igneus est illi vigor et cœlestis origo Semini.” And he interprets the σπέρμα of the *sanctification of the Holy Spirit*, by which it reforms the will, and produces salutary fruits. Galat. 5, 22. An antient Interpreter ap. Œcumen, understands it of the Spirit, received at Baptism.

10. ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστι—αὐτοῦ. Here the Apostle repeats what he had before said, that “every one who does not practice righteousness, is not of God :” but in the words ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστι τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, he means to say, that *by this*, i. e. the having, or not having or practising this righteousness, the children of God are plainly distinguished from those of the devil. Φανερά, “plain (to be distinguished).”

On this general position the Apostle engrafts a more *special* one, regarding that part of the duty to men which consists in love and kindness to our brethren, i. e. not only our brother *Christians*, but our brother *men*. So Carpz. explains it φιλαδελφία, φιλανθρωπία. Now this is so important as to form a test of our being sons of God. See Bens.

The phrases made use of have been all before explained.

11. From hence to ver. 24. the Apostle continues the above exhortation, and urges it by various arguments; 1. That the precept is of equal antiquity and authority with that enjoining holiness of life, as originating in Christ himself.

Ἀγγελία is commonly interpreted *message*: but it seems to denote a *command* to be delivered to others, an *injunction*. See Bens.

12. οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν. This, Rosenm. says, is an elliptical expression for οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ καθὼς Κάϊν ἦν. But it seems to be rather an idiotical and provincial form of expression: and we may suppose an ellipsis of οὕτω ποιῶμεν ὅς, “And *not* as Cain, who was a son of the devil, and murdered his brother (*so let us do*, by repressing that love, and fostering those feelings of hatred, which may tend to murder).” Then, by way of caution, the Apostle suggests the *cause* of this hatred, namely, envy and malice at his brother’s superior goodness and favour with God. In which view Rosenm. cites Cic. Cat. Maj.

13. μὴ θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοὶ μου, εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. Grot., Bens., and Rosenm. think there is here an *igitur*; taking this to be an inference from the preceding example. So Rosenm. observes: “*Mores contrarii et perversi solent semina et causæ esse discordiæ et odiorum.*” And he adds: “*Indicium enim impiorum est semper insectari pios.*” Yet the Apostle seems, from the next verse, to hint that as the profane world was sure to hate Christians, so *they* should the more love each other.

14. ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι—ἀδελφοί. Bens. well paraphrases thus: “But let us not be discouraged by that hatred, since we have such glorious prospects. For we know that we have passed over from that state in which we were liable to the second death, into that in which we have a well-grounded title to immortal life, because we love the Christian

brethren. He that loveth not his Christian brother, still remaineth liable to the second death." See his note.

15. *πάς ὁ μισῶν—ἐστί.* A fifth reason for their cultivating love to the Christian brethren; namely, "that hatred of them, or want of love to them, was a sort of murder, or one step towards it." And who would not be shocked at the thought of being a murderer? (Bens.) Now this was meant to explain the introduction (somewhat abrupt) of Cain the *fratricide*, ver. 12. *Ἀνθρωποκτόνος* imports "a disposition which tends to violence and murder." So, I find, Virg. *Æn.* 6, 607., places in his Tartarus those "quibus *invisi fratres*, dum vita manebat." And as murder cannot but exclude from eternal life, so must that which is the seed and origin of it disqualify any one to be a son of God. So Rosenm. observes, that the intentions are the same in both. And it may be added, as Christ not only forbade *adultery*, but an *evil eye*, so is not only *murder* forbidden, but *malevolence* and *anger*, which tend to it. The same applies to all other crimes.

16. *ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν—ἔθηκε,* "By this we (may) know (what) love (is), namely, that he laid down his life for us, and (thus) ought we to lay down our lives for our brethren." Now *ἀγάπη*, like all names of virtues and vices used in a general way, takes the article. And Rosenm. renders: "the true nature of love." But it must surely be mentioned with reference to *Christ*, i. e. (as Carpz. renders) *amor immensus Christi erga redemptos*. With the *ἐκείνος* Carpz. compares a similar use of the Hebr. *הוא*.

The *καὶ* contains the apodosis, "and we, on our parts, in return." On *τιθέναι ψυχὴν*, see Joh. 10, 11. 15, 17. 13, 37 & 38. &c. On the force of the expression *ὀφείλομεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς τιθέναι*, much has been written. It would seem most agreeable to the words to understand it, with Grot., Areteus, and others, of *martyrdom*, which many were then called upon to endure. Yet this the context

scarcely permits. I am therefore inclined to think, with Carpz., Rosenm., and Jaspis, that here is to be considered alone the *notio universalis*, and the expression (which seems to be proverbial), is not to be rigorously interpreted, but understood of *making very great sacrifices*, exposing ourselves to imminent perils, as *omnia facere aliorum caussa*, signifies *quævis officia humanitatis et charitatis, et fidem præstare summam*. See more in Carpz., who adduces Scriptural examples. See also Doddr.

17. ὅς δ' ἂν ἔχῃ—ἐν αὐτῷ. Βίον, *facultates, property*, that on which we live. See Schleus. Lex. Χρεῖαν ἔχειν, is one of the many phrases formed from ἔχω and a noun, and signifies to *be in need*. Καὶ κλείσῃ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. On σπλ. see Luke 1, 78. 2 Cor. 6, 11., and the note. Αποκλείειν signifies to *shut out*, and here it is used figuratively of shutting up one's heart, and barring it against the entrance of compassion. In πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, the interrogation involves a strong negation.

18. μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν—ἀληθεία. In this antithetical sentence λόγῳ and ἔργῳ (which are often opposed in the Classical writers) are explained, and the sense strengthened by γλώσση and ἀληθεία. The sentiment inculcated is obvious. Compare James 2, 15 & 16. Wets. cites Theogn. 972., to which I add Soph. Antig. 539. λόγοις δ' ἔγω φιλοῦσαν οὐ στέργω φίλην.

19. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμὲν, “And by this we know whether we are of the truth (in this respect,” i. e. of love to others). Rosenm. compares the phrases ἐκ Θεοῦ εἶναι, and εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, i. e. to be agreeable to truth, and sincerely profess it. And Carpz. adds, ἐκ τοῦ Διαβόλου εἶναι, Joh. 3, 8. ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, &c. The ἀληθ. he explains *true religion*. Carpz. understands it of the pure doctrines of the Gospel, or holiness of life, or *both*. Thus he takes the expression ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι to be equivalent to ἀληθινοὶ εἶναι; and therefore by οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας may be denoted *true Christians*, sons of God, and united with him. But the context seems

to limit the expression to that part of true Christianity, which consists in *love of our neighbour* for God's sake.

19. καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. The future indicative is here for the subjunctive. The sense is: "And in the sight, in respect of Him (our Judge), we may, in this important respect, pacify, set at rest, and quiet our hearts." For he who truly loves all men, may trust that the mercy and favour of God will not be withheld from *him*. On the above signification of *πείθω* something apposite may be found in the note on Matt. 28, 14. See also Grot. and Bens.

20. ὅτι ἔάν—γινώσκει πάντα. Some difficulty here arises from extreme brevity, to remove which a clause must be supplied from the preceding verse, either (with Bens.) at the commencement of the sentence; *or*, (with Rosenm.) after *καρδία*, thus: "But if our heart and conscience condemn us of want of this kind feeling towards men (then may we *not* set our minds at rest, and hope for the mercy and favour of God)." Such seems to be the more natural method, and it is supported by the authority of the antients. (See, however, another proposed by Morus and Noesselt. ap. Rosenm.) But perhaps this clause, and especially the next and more difficult one, may be illustrated by supposing an *aposiopesis*. The words *μείζων ἐστὶν—πάντα*, may be thus rendered: "Nay, still less reason can we have to assure our hearts, since God knoweth far more of our failings than even our memories and consciences can supply (for He knoweth them all); still less reason, therefore, will there be to assure our hearts." See Slade.

21. εἰν ἡ καρδία—Θεόν. This is the opposite to the former sentiment. The *μὴ καταγινώσκει* must not be rigorously interpreted: and the case supposed is that of a son of God whose conscience is clear, not seared, and deadened by repeated strokes, and where the examination has been diligent, and the scrutiny unsparing.

The *παρρ.* has been before explained. On the term see the note on Hebr. 4, 16. Bens., Schoettg., and Vater rightly connect these words with the preceding, as assigning a reason for his holy confidence. A punctuation strongly supported by 5, 14.

22. Here St. John assigns another reason for cultivating universal righteousness, and particularly mutual love; namely, "that then their prayers would be heard, and God would grant them all proper blessings." (Bens.)

23. *καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ—ἡμῖν*, "And his commandment, the chief of all, is, that we believe in the Divine mission of his Son Jesus Christ, and love each other according to the injunction he gave us." Carpz. takes *ἡ ἐντολὴ* to mean the *sum* of the precepts: q. d. "*Ordo salutis talia postulat*," *πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην*; as 1 Tim. 1, 5. *τὸ τέλος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ πίστεως*. Rosenm. observes, that the singular is used, because one precept follows from the other. He therefore who believeth in Jesus, and loveth his fellow creatures, obeys the religion of God, and is accepted by him (ver. 24).

24. *καὶ ὁ τηρῶν—αὐτῶ*, "And he who keepeth his precepts (generally) abideth in Him, and He in him;" which implies love and favour and blessing from God. In the next sentence is given a test of the having this abiding of God in them, namely, by the imparting of the Holy Spirit and its gifts, whether extraordinary or ordinary, which, in either case, imply the approbation and favour of God, and from the presence or absence of which we may infer our spiritual state. Such seems to be the true sense, though the Commentators do not quite see it. Rosenm. compares Eph. 1, 14. 2 Cor. 1, 22. and Mackn., Joh. 14, 23. Benson well observes, that from this text and 2, 20 and 27. and 5, 16. it appears that many of those to whom the Apostle wrote, had the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Nay, he says, that most, if not *all*, the adult Christians every

where had those miraculous gifts. But this seems on many accounts utterly incredible.

CHAP. IV.

VER. 1—6. What has just been said of true Christians having the Spirit, as a proof of Divine favour, introduces a digression on false teachers, or persons pretending to spiritual gifts; and rules are given for discriminating one from the other.

1. μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε. By πνευμ. most Commentators understand one *setting up for an inspired teacher*; as 1 Tim. 4, 1. and 1 Cor. 12, 10. And Rosenm. observes: “Nam *profiteri* est hominis concedentis aliquid, vel negantis.” But actions are often ascribed to *things*, especially faculties which tend to produce action. And some Commentators maintain that it signifies the *Spirit*, by which the man is actuated. (See Bens.) This, however, comes to the same thing; or both may be admitted; nay, the signification *doctrines* (which some adopt) may be *included*. Here I would compare Philostr. Vit. Ap. 3, 45. Olear. καὶ γὰρ κέρδος εἴη μήτε πιστεύειν, μήτε ἀπιστεῖν πᾶσιν. Phocyl. 13, 74. μὴ πίστευε τάχιστα, πρὶν ἀτρεκέως πέρας ὄψει. Diog. Laert. 9, 38. δοκιμάζειν τὰς φαντασίας.

1. ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν. Here πνεῦμα must be taken in the second and third of the above senses, i. e. “try whether they seem to have originated from God and the Holy Spirit.” The *reason* given is, that many *false* teachers are gone abroad into the world. The ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον is explained by Grot. and most Commentators, publicè se ostenderunt, vel apparuerunt populo; as Joh. 6, 14. 10, 36. 12, 46. Still there is no example of ἐξερχ. εἰς τὸν κοσμ., which appears to be a provincial expression.

2. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκετε τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, “By this rule which follows (a rule, too, given by Christ,

Matt. 11, 6. 26, 31.), *ye may know.*" A sense of the present Indicative, frequent in St. John. Our English Translators, and Doddr., take *γινώσκειτε* in the *Imperative*. But this is not so proper, nor so suited to the Apostle's style.

2. *πάν πνεῦμα ὁ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, ἐκ τ. Θ. ἐ.*

The *πνεῦμα* must have the *first* of the above senses, i. e. the *person*. 'Ὁμολογεῖ is rendered, by Rosenm., *docet*. But it rather signifies, "*professes and teaches.*" Ἐρχεσθαι is a vox solennis of the mission and appearance of Divine legates. Ἐν σαρκί. It is truly remarkable that so many able Commentators, as Grot., Vorst., and others ap. Pole, should take up with an interpretation which could only have been expected from the Socinians (who are resolved to find their opinions every where), namely, "*was a mere man.*"* Which is so contrary to St. John's perpetual assertions in his Gospel and Epistles, that it cannot be the sense. And even had that *not* been the case, the sense were too strained and unnatural a one to be adopted. Adverting to the known opinions of the hereticks of that age, which consisted not in a denial of the *Divinity*, but the *humanity* of Christ, the best Commentators are agreed that there is reference to the tenets of the Doctors and others, who held Jesus Christ to have been a mere φάντασμα, and not having a real body. Now the Apostle maintains that he came really (clothed) in the flesh, i. e. in a human body, and subject to all corporeal pains and weaknesses. As to the being a *mere man*, that is quite another thing; and that St. John could not mean that is clear from what has been said above, nay, the passage supplies an inference the very contrary. The arguments for the other interpretation, adduced by Grot., Vorst., and Schliting, are too weak to merit attention; and the interpretation above adopted is established, beyond doubt, by Bens. and Carpzov.

The var. lect. ὁ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν may be justly considered, with Mill, &c., as a mere marginal Scholium. And the textual reading, here and just after, besides other proofs, is established by an imitation of St. John's disciple, Polycarp, Epist. ad Phil. §. 2. (cited by Carpz.) πᾶς γὰρ ὅς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθῆναι.

3. καὶ *πάν πνεῦμα ὁ μὴ—ἔστι.* This is (after the manner of St. John) a strengthening of the position just laid down by an affirmation of the *converse*. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου—ἡδὴ. Here there is

* Now (as Mackn. observes) the Doctors as well as people believed the Son of God to be himself God. This has been abundantly proved by some learned Jews. See the Lettres de quelques Juifs, addressed to Voltaire, and the Vindiciæ Biblicæ of a learned Jew of this country.

an ellipsis either of *χρῆμα*, or *πρᾶγμα*, or of *σημείον*, or (as Carpzov and most Commentators suppose) *πνεῦμα*. See the note on 2, 18., from which and the present passage, Mackn. observes, "it appears that Antichrist is not any particular person, nor any particular succession of persons in the church, but a general term for all false teachers in every age." Now these false prophets, Carpzov remarks, had, in various places, appeared, and endeavoured to persuade others that the Messiah would come *μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας*, and not *ἐν σαρκί*. But, especially among the *Philippians*, there seem to have been these enemies *τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, of whom both St. Paul makes mention in his Epistle 3, 18., and Polycarp in his Ep. §. 13. *πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰ. Χ. ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, Ἀντίχριστός ἐστι· καὶ ὃς μὴ ὁμολογήσῃ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶ*.

4. *ὅμοις ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστε, τέκνία, καὶ νενικήκατε αὐτούς*. Rosenm. takes the expression *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι* to be equivalent to *intelligens esse religionis*. But this is too limited a sense. It must here denote those who to sound *knowledge* unite right dispositions, supported by the Holy Spirit. See more in the note on ver. 1. and elsewhere. *Νενικήκατε* (which is vaguely explained by Rosenm.) must signify, "ye have thwarted and frustrated all their attempts, by force, or fraud, to pervert you from the truth, and purity of the Gospel." The next words *ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν ἢ ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* seem to have reference to a clause omitted; not, however, that supplied by Benson, but the following: "(and no wonder) because," &c. The *ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν* must denote, "God, who, by the Holy Spirit, enlightens and strengthens you."

The *ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* is explained, by Rosenm., "in scii errori et ignorantiae dediti;" q. d. "The doctrine of God, which is in you, is strong enough to refute those who are given to error; Verum est magis potentiae falso, præponderat falso;" as if no more be meant than the adage, "Truth is mighty

and will prevail." But this is an utter perversion of a passage which plainly inculcates the doctrine of *spiritual influence*, both for good, and for evil.

5. αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσι, "The teachers I allude to are *not* (I repeat) of God, but are of the world, mere worldlings. Hence from that spirit they speak, and (from the same spirit) the world heareth them (and receives doctrines adapted to their taste)." Such is (I conceive) the full sense; and all the above subauditions are requisite. See Benson. Rosenm. illustrates the sense from Joh. 3, 31.

6. ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. By ἡμεῖς, the best Commentators are agreed, is meant, "we, the Apostles." But it may include other divinely commissioned teachers; as Timothy, Titus, and others. Ἀκούειν is here to be taken as in the preceding verse. See Benson.

6. ἐκ τούτου γινώσκμεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης. From this, i. e. the receiving, or the rejecting this doctrine, we may know (i. e. per κοινωνίαν, "ye may know") how to distinguish the spirit of truth, and that of error (and the persons who are thereby actuated).*

7. The Apostle now returns to the subject of love to others, treated of at 3, 23. And this reiteration Benson ascribes to the false teachers being very defective in this duty. Ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ. Grot. observes, that by the very *name of the Deity* every one understands what is most excellent. We may, however, especially advert to *that* name by

* "None (observes Benson) but Apostles and Prophets, persons who gave abundant proof of a divine mission, can justly speak in this knowledge, and make the following them, or their doctrines, the standard of truth, or detection of error." I would add that, as *then* the receiving the Apostles as divinely commissioned teachers, and embracing their doctrines, was the way to distinguish those who were of God; so now the reverently receiving the truths of the Gospel as contained in the Holy Scriptures, and promulgated by God's ministers, properly commissioned, is the touch-stone to try men's hearts, whether they "savour of the things that be of God," or "those that be of men."

which the Northern languages designate Him, and which, I believe, to be the adjective *good* taken substantively.

The phrases "*to be born of God* and *to know God*," have been before explained. They, of course, imply an *imitation* of the excellences of God. "Such a person (to use the words of Benson in his paraphrase), like a genuine son, resembles his heavenly Father, and shows that he rightly understands the nature and will of God, as made known by the Christian revelation."

8. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν, &c. This, after the foregoing note, can require little explanation. Οὐκ ἔγνω must mean, "does not truly know God." Ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, "God is love itself," i. e. the most benevolent of beings, *the* benevolent Being. See Benson.

9. ἐν τούτῳ—ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ. Here we have the same sentiment as at Joh. 3, 16., where see the note. Ἐν ἡμῖν, "in respect of us." By ζήσωμεν are denoted all the blessings of the Gospel, both in this world and especially in the next. Rosenm. explains it, knowledge, virtue, peace of mind, hope of felicity here, and the fruition of it hereafter. Σώζειν, σωτηρία, &c. have sometimes this extensive sense.

10. ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη. Quod generalius dixerat, id specialiùs explicat. (Grot.) St. John's meaning is, that God loved us *first*. (See ver. 19.) Men are, generally, very ready to love those by whom they are *first* beloved. But such was the astonishing love of God to men, that, when they were sinners and enemies, he so loved the world as to send his most beloved Son to live and die for them. This was a matter of free-grace, or pure favour. (Bens.)

10. οὐχ ὅτι. For ὅτι οὐχ. "This love was especially stamped by his sending (as a pledge of it) his beloved Son, for the purpose of expiating our sins."

11. ἀγαπητοὶ, εἰ—ἀγαπᾶν. The Apostle directs us to imitate the example of Him whose sons we profess to be.

12. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται. Bens. paraphrases:

“No man hath, with his bodily eyes, seen God at any time.” And, therefore, we cannot have such visible converse and sensible communion with him, as we may have one with another. But if we love one another, we are in the Divine favour, and our love of God is perfect and complete.” So Rosenm.: “no one is conversant with God, as men with men; but although there be not such a society with God, yet we assuredly know that we do love and are loved by him, if we love others.” The words *ὁ Θεός ἐν ἡμῖν μένει*, &c., signify that there is real conjunction and perfect love.

13. *ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν—ἡμῖν*. The same sentiment as at 3, 4., except that here is added *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν*. The Apostle now mentions *another* evidence that we are united with God, namely, that although God be not *visibly* present, yet we enjoy the benefits he confers on us, and so we know we are conjoined with him. (Rosenm.) The *πνευμ.* comprises all the manifestations of the Spirit, both ordinary, and extraordinary, on which so much has been already said.

14. *καὶ ἡμεῖς τεθεάμεθα—κόσμου*. *Σωτῆρα* is in apposition with *υἱόν*, and has the sense of, *as Saviour*, i. e. to be the Saviour. There seems to be a clause omitted, which Rosenm. well supplies thus (as to what I said, “that the Son was sent by God for the salvation of men,” and that thus a striking proof was given of the love of God, no one should doubt): *for* we are eye-witnesses to the thing. We have seen him dead and risen again.” Now that he should die for the redemption of the human race our Lord had said, Matt. 20, 26 & 28., and assuredly God would not have raised him from the dead, had he been a deceiver.

15. *ὁς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι—Θεῷ*. On the connection see Benson. The sense is: “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God (the Saviour sent for our salvation), he is really united with God (in mutual love).” Now the Apostle takes for *granted*,

not only that the profession is sincere, but productive of a suitable conduct. And, indeed, as in times like those, open confession and undaunted profession *implied sincerity*, it was likely to draw with it the other. See Benson.

16. καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν—ἡμῖν. “And (to induce men so to believe) we (Apostles) can affirm that we do *surely know* the love which God hath to us.” See the note on ver. 14. Ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη—ἐν αὐτῷ. An earnest repetition of what was said supra, ver. 8 & 12. & 3, 24.

17. ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται—κρίσεως, “By this (may we know that) our love is perfect and sincere, namely, by having confidence (of our acceptance) in the day of judgment.” Such seems to be the true sense. Though Translators and Commentators differ, and especially on the signification of ἵνα. See Pole’s Synop., Wolf, and Benson. Μεθ’ ἡμῶν, *within us, in us*. A rare sense.

17. ὅτι καθὼς—τούτῳ, namely, “for the reason that as God is (thus disposed towards us men), so also are we in this world (disposed) towards others, namely, because we imitate the example of love, &c. set us by our heavenly Father, and therefore may hope for acceptance.” Such (chiefly formed upon Benson and Rosenm.) seems to be the true sense, though the Commentators differ. See Pole’s Syn. and Carpzov.

18. φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν—ἔχει. The literal sense is as follows: “(Slavish) fear exists not in this love, but perfect love (such as this) casts aside fear; for (such) fear carries with it terror (which is inconsistent with love; since) he who so feareth is not perfected in love, does not love perfectly and sincerely.” Φόβος here signifies a fear, not of displeasing God, but of incurring his punishment, which conscience raises. The rest of the sentence requires little explanation. See Benson, or Rosenm. and Slade, the latter of whom truly observes that *casting out fear* cannot mean the fear of losing or suffering any thing

by means of our brother; for, in truth, perfect love might not always exclude such a fear: but the expression plainly refers to the preceding verse, and is contrasted with a joyful confidence in the mercy of God; and the word *κόλασις*, which follows, is properly opposed to that feeling of satisfaction and delight which flows from such a confidence.

19. *ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶμεν—ἡμᾶς*. The best Commentators, from Grot. downwards, take *ἀγαπῶμεν* in the subjunctive (on which see Benson): "Let us therefore (so) love him, because he first loved us." A repetition of the argument above. *Πρῶτος* is here put for *πρότερος*.

20. *ἐὰν τις—ψεύστης ἐστίν*. The reason is plain. For he really loves God who *imitates* him. Now in God is the most perfect benevolence towards all men. Whosoever, therefore, hateth men, hateth God, and thwarts his benevolent designs. (Rosenm.) *Ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἀγαπῶν—ἀγαπᾶν*. Rosenm. compares Philo de Decal. p. 761 D. *ἀμήχανον εὐσεβεῖσθαι τὸν ἀόρατον ὑπὸ τῶν εἰς τοὺς ἐμφανεῖς καὶ ἐγγὺς ἀσεβούντων*. He also gives a statement of the argument. The following, however, given by Slade (from Whitby) is the simpler. "The Apostle is contrasting our love of God with the love of our neighbour: in a religious point of view, the obligation to both is the same; both being equally enjoined, ver. 21. And with respect to circumstances, purely natural, we have more powerful motives to the love of our neighbour, as being more fully acquainted with him by ocular experience, than we can possibly be with God." See 2, 4. 9, 10 & 11. 3, 17. 4, 12. and the notes. Benson observes that there is an allusion to the proverb, "*Ignoti nulla cupido*." But that seems little probable.

21. *καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν—ἔχομεν—αὐτοῦ*. The *ἐντολὴ* here is the *ἀγγελία* mentioned at 3, 11., where see the note. Now this *ἐντολὴ* is, that "he who professes to love God, should love his brother also."

Otherwise, by neglecting the latter, he cannot acceptably perform the former. It is the union of both that can alone obtain the favour of God.

CHAP. V.

VERSE 1. From hence, to ver. 13., St. John continues to recommend that love of the Christian brethren which arises from a love to God, and a regard to his commandments: and intimates, that a true faith in Jesus, as *the Christ*, will enable us to overcome the temptations of this world. And to establish such a faith in them, he refers them to the testimony or evidence which God had given to the mission of his Son Jesus Christ, to which, if they paid a proper regard, they might, through him, expect everlasting life. (Bens.)

1. *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι—γεγέννηται.* This is closely connected with the preceding: and the Apostle goes on to enjoin mutual love of Christian brethren; urging it on *this* ground, that Christians are children of God, our heavenly Father. The *πιστεύων* implies (as Rosenm. explains) a true and sincere belief, and that shown in a profession of faith, in a hope in the promises, and, as resulting from that hope, a fulfilment of the precepts. On the force of *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγ.* see the notes on 3, 9., and 4, 7. The *καὶ* at *καὶ πᾶς*, signifies *but*. Of *πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν*, which words have the air of an adage, the sense is obvious: but, as Rosenm. observes, we are to understand them of *brothers* of a *common* father.

2. *ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι—τηρωμεν.* These words are connected with the preceding; the Apostle arguing *e generali ad speciale*. Since what was said at ver. 1., was *universally* true, so also it holds good of the *love of God*. (Rosenm.) There has here been some doubt about the construction, and, as dependent thereon, the sense; and the *contrary* would seem more apposite. Œcumen. supposes an *inver-*

sion, Grot., a *transposition* ; thus : ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν, ὅταν ἀγαπῶμεν τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. And so Dr. Clarke. Carpz. would take ἀγαπῶμεν for a second Future; and he renders the ὅταν *quamdiu*. Another interpretation is proposed by Morus, which may be seen in Rosenm. The *first* mentioned method seems to be somewhat preferable, but it is utterly unauthorized, and too violent to be admitted. Indeed, the sense yielded by the words as they now stand, is unobjectionable in itself, and not inapposite; and they may be thus rendered: "By this may we know that we love the children of God aright, when (or in that) we love God, and keep his commandments." The *aright* is well supplied by Bens.; and the ὅταν is by Rosenm. taken for ὅτι; though that is not absolutely necessary.

3. αὕτη γὰρ—τηρῶμεν, "for this is the decisive proof of our love to God, that we keep his commandments." The Commentators remark that the ἀγάπη is to be taken *objectively*, and there is in it a metonymy for *ostensi amoris*. And they might have compared 4, 10., ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη ὅτι, &c. On the *sentiment* see Bens. The words καὶ αἱ ἐντολαί, &c., are supposed by him to answer to a probable objection; and he thinks there is a *meiosis*; referring to Matt. 11, 28—30., and other texts. It should rather seem that they are levelled against the Jews or Judaizers, who supported a system whose injunctions were a heavy burthen; whereas the yoke of Christ is comparatively easy, and his burthen light. And, as Slade says, "this must refer not to extreme but to ordinary cases." In proof of this the Apostle, in proceeding to show *how* it is easy, adverts to those points in which the Gospel is especially superior to the Law, namely, the *love* of God, as opposed to the *fear* of him, that *renewal of the heart* by the communication of Divine Grace, which the Law did not, and *could* not provide. The sentiments of the

Heathen writers on this subject are adduced by Grot. and Pricæus, with which we may dispense.

4. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, νικᾷ τὸν κόσμον, “Now, as a proof of this (γὰρ), whosoever is born of God, conquers (the temptations of) the world.” Πᾶν is the neuter for the masculine. An idiom common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and which indicates *universality*. Here it is possible there is an ellipsis of γένος. Whether it *comprehends* (as Slade thinks) the regenerate principle in the soul, may be doubted. What is meant by the being born of God, and the mode by which the victory is obtained, has been before shown. But the *grand principle* by which the victory is obtained, is suggested by the Apostle himself in the words καὶ αὕτη—πίστις ἡμῶν, where at νίκη there is a metonymy of the *effect* for the *efficient*; and αὕτη is for τοῦτο; as just before. The Aorist is used to denote what happens at all times, and is customary. *How* faith produces this effect, can require no explication.

5. τίς ἐστίν—Θεοῦ. Here (as Rosenm. observes) the Interrogation is strongly affirmative; as 2, 22.; q. d. “if such a person cannot conquer the world, no other can.” Now, the believing that Jesus is the Son of God, signifies not only *believing in his Godhead* (for such is the import of the title *Son of God*, on which see the excellent note of Mackn., and Horsley ap. Slade), but in his *power* and *ability* to impart salvation, by atoning for our sins. This will apply to every individual, since all are sinners. The connection with the following is thus traced by Rosenm.: The reason why he who believes Jesus to be the Son of God, can overcome evil affections is, that in him was fulfilled all that was expected from the Messiah. For he both instituted *baptism*, and expiated us by his *blood*. To this is added the weighty *testimony of God himself*. These three things, then, as confirming the same thing, take away all doubt.” See Bens.

6. οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός.

The best Commentators are agreed that here διὰ is put for ἐν (which, as well as διὰ, is often put for σὺν), and that ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος signifies, "came with the use of (i. e. introducing) baptism, and in order to shed his blood," i. e. in order to purify and to save. See Pole's Syn. (cited by Slade), and also Whitby, Doddr., and Mackn. Many recent Commentators, as Zachariæ, Bengel, Moldenh., and Rosenm., think that by his *baptism* is meant his own baptism by John, when was pronounced the testimony of God to his Divine mission. This appears to me not so suitable a sense. The opinion of Gomar, Hamm., Bens., and Horsley, that the Apostle meant the blood and water which issued from our Lord's side, has little probability, and is refuted by Mr. Slade. As to the interpretation of Grot., it is utterly untenable. I must, for my own part, acquiesce in the opinion of Whitby, and others above referred to; and I cannot but think, with Carpz., that St. John intended the *two sacraments*; by *water*, meaning the λούτρον παλιγγενεσίας, and by *blood*, i. e. the Lord's Supper, in which the wine is poured out as a symbol of the blood of the New Covenant. By the former (Carpz. adds), we are regenerated, and become sons of God; and by the latter, we are united with God, and obtain a victory over the world (ver. 4 & 5.).

In the words οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ τῷ αἵματι the Apostle (as Rosenm. observes) shows that the words preceding were expressed *consideratè*. Compare Joh. 19, 30. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶ τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθεία, "Moreover it is the Spirit that hath taught us this doctrine respecting the Saviour, and the purpose of his coming upon the earth, and hath borne *witness* to the truth thereof; and firmly may we rely on his testimony, since that Spirit is *truth itself*." Such seems to be the best founded sense. Rosenm. thinks, that the last words refer to those passages of the Gospel of St. John, where the *Spirit of truth* is mentioned. The ἀληθεία he refers to the αὐθεντία and ἀξιοπιστία of the divine testimony. And the ὅτι (he observes) answers to the Hebr. כִּי, *siquidem, quippe*. Various, however, are the interpretations of the passage that have been proposed, for which I must refer the reader to Pole, Wolf, Bens., and Rosenm.

7, 8. On these very celebrated verses tracts, nay whole volumes have been written. It were hopeless for me to attempt, in such a limited space as the nature of my plan permits (and especially to-

wards the conclusion of a work which has already far exceeded the prescribed bounds,) to give any satisfactory view of so extensive a question as they involve. I think it better, therefore, *for the present*, to decline any examination of the passage; and I am the more induced to do this, since able condensed views of the question are to be found in works which I presume most of my readers possess, especially Slade's Annotations, Horne's Introduction, Nolan on the Greek Vulgate, and finally (*instar omnium*), the recent Treatise of the venerable and very learned Bp. Burgess, which has caused some of those who were most firmly opposed to the authenticity of the verses to hesitate, and others, to sing their *παλινῳδία*. Now as few could have conceived it possible for so *much more* to have been said in defence of the verses than had before been brought forward, and as no one can foresee the perfection to which Biblical research may hereafter be carried, so I would deprecate that spirit by which this and other similar supports of our faith are abandoned, with an inconsiderateness that contemplates our stores as inexhaustible.

To me it appears *probable* that the verses are genuine: but I am inclined to agree with the learned Bps. Horsley and Middleton that they will, if genuine, not *decidedly* prove the doctrine of the Trinity; and therefore by far too much anxiety about the determination of the critical question as to their authenticity has been felt and expressed by the Orthodox in general. Much, too, is it to be lamented that controversies on a passage which affects (as most think) our *faith*, should have been made the means of violating that *Christian charity* without which faith itself and knowledge were vain, and a tinkling cymbal.

9. εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν. Λαμβ., "receive and admit a testimony in a court of justice." A forensic term. Thus according to Deut. 17, 6. 19, 15. the testimony of two or three witnesses was to be received. Hence the Apostle adds: ὅτι αὕτη—υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, "For that is to be accounted as the testimony of God, which he hath testified of his Son." From this concurrent testimony it appears, that Jesus was declared to be the Son of God by God himself. (Rosenm.) See Bens., from whom the above is chiefly derived.

10. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, "He that believeth on Jesus, as the Son of God, or the Messiah, hath received, and retains in himself, the above mentioned divine testimony." (Bens.) Ἐχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ is emphatical, and indicates firm assent, surety, and safety. See Est., who takes the ἐν for σὺν, *secum*. Ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ

Θεῶ, ψεύστην πεποίηκεν, “ treats God as a liar; acts as if he thought him so;” as 1, 10. The preterite is put for the present, “ *more Hebræo*,” Grot. says; but this use is found in the Classical writers. In ὅτι οὐ—τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Θεός is put for αὐτὸς. In which Grot. again recognises a Hebraism. But it seems rather used *reverenter*. The idiom in μαρτυρίαν μεμαρτ. is very common.

11. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία—αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, “ And this is (the chief thing testified to *summum testimoni-um*, as Rosenm. explains) that he hath bestowed on us (the means of attaining) eternal salvation. And this salvation is attained through his Son.” Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, as Joh. 1, 19. “ Here (observes Rosenm.) St. John shows how nearly our happiness is connected with this doctrine of Jesus, the Son of God. For by the Son is obtained salvation; by him the Father has opened the way to eternal bliss. Therefore the sum of the Gospel consists in acknowledging Jesus as the Christ, or the Son of God. Compare Joh. 17, 3. Matt. 16, 16.”

12. ὁ ἔχων—ζωήν. Rosenm. takes ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν for ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ὡς υἱόν; as Matt. 145. ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. See Hardy. Vorst. and Pisc. explain: “ amplexitur per fidem affectuosam et obedientem.” But I prefer (with Benson) to take the ἔχων for κατέχων; not unlike the ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ at ver. 10. “ Ἐχει τὴν ζωήν. Grot., Hardy, and others explain, “ hath a promise of and sure title to eternal life.” Rosenm.: “ may hope for.” So Menoch.: “ habet vitam gratiæ in re, et gloriæ in spe,” hath the means of attaining it. The *opposite* is expressed in οὐ μὴ—οὐχ ἔχει, which words require no explanation.

13. ταῦτα—τοῦ Θεοῦ. There seems, at first sight, a sort of tautology in these words. But this is removed by supposing, with Vorst., Beza, Gom., Hamm., Bens., Carpz., and Rosen., that πιστεύειν here denotes emphatically a continuance, constancy in, and increase of belief. Which is preferable to reading, with Grot., for ἵνα πιστ., οἱ πιστεύοντες; a mere

emendation. The sense is: "that ye may know and be assured that ye have (thereby) the means of attaining eternal life; and that (knowing this), ye may indeed believe and continue in the pure Gospel."

14. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παρρησία. "To enforce the foregoing exhortation to believers, namely, to be confirmed and constant in the faith, the Apostle shows them here what a special advantage believers have above other persons, namely, confidence in all their approaches to God, and a full assurance. There seems to be in this and the next verse an allusion to the promise which our Lord made to his Apostles, and which John has recorded in his Gospel, c. 14, 12—14.; also c. 16, 23 and 24." (Valpy.)

The αὕτη ἡ παρρησία is used as the preceding αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία, αὕτη ἡ μαρτυρία. The sense is: "and on this (namely, that we know we may expect future salvation,) rests our sure confidence in God." Παρρησία is taken as at 3, 21.

14. ὅτι ἐὰν τι αἰτώμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ἀκούει ἡμῶν, "that if we pray for any thing according to his will, he will hear us." The κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ is explained by Rosenm., "such things as may tend to his glory, and to our spiritual good." What is chiefly inculcated (continues he) is, that we are to leave all to the divine will, according to which the whole universe is governed after the example of Christ, who prayed: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not my will, but thine be done." Bens. understands the whole of this verse and the remaining ones as chiefly containing directions to those who had the extraordinary and miraculous spiritual gifts, how to use them. But though that seems to throw some light on ver. 16 and 17., yet it is too hypothetical to be safely adopted. It, therefore, appears better, with most Commentators, to keep these separate from the two following (which seem addressed to the *Apostles* only), and understand them of the prayers of Christians in general.

15. καὶ ἐὰν οἴδαμεν ὅτι—αὐτοῦ. Plain as the words

may seem, there is some difficulty in the *sentiment*, which Morus ap. Rosenm. attempts to remove by rendering thus: "Et si hoc est verum, eum nos exaudire, verum est et hoc: nos habere res petitas ab illo (nosque eas illi debere acceptas referre)." But to lay such a stress on *παρ' αὐτοῦ*, is too arbitrary and harsh. It is better to take the words in their plain and natural sense, thus: "And knowing, as we do, that he heareth us, in whatever petitions we prefer, we may know that we have (i. e. shall have) from him the petitions we *thus* (i. e. according to his will) desired of him." At *ὁ* must be understood *κατὰ*. The difficulty, which perplexes almost all the Commentators, may be removed, by supposing (with Doddr.) that *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα* is to be supplied from the preceding verse. Or at least the *petitions* must be supposed *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα* (in the sense that has been just explained); for otherwise, the Apostle's own words teach us, they will not be patiently *heard*, much less *granted*. Now the above will hold good, whether the petitions were for ordinary blessings, or extraordinary interpositions.

16, 17. *ἐὰν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν—θάνατον.*

Gomar observes, that from prayer offered up for *ourselves* St. John passes to that offered up for *others*. The passage, however, is involved in great obscurity. The difficulty chiefly rests with the phrases *ἁμαρτία μὴ πρὸς θάνατον*, and *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον*, as also *ζῶην* just after. By the *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον* some understand the *sin against the Holy Ghost*. Others, *any grievous sin*, as idolatry, homicide, adultery. Others, again, as Schoettg., such a sin as was held capital in the Mosaic Law. All very improbable. More attention is due to the interpretation of Carpz., whom see. As to that of Rosenm. (also embraced by Morus), though ingenious, it is so much at variance with the context, and (as Jaspis says) so abhorrent from the style of St. John, that it cannot be safely adopted. I, however, so far agree with Rosenm., that these verses are in some measure distinct; since they seem to regard prayer in *extraordinary* cases, as the other, *ordinary* ones. But I cannot assent to the opinion of Bens, Mackn., and others, that the words are to be interpreted of the *body*, not the soul; and that the Apostle alludes to those diseases which were inflicted as a punishment for sin, and which were often healed by the prayer and anointing of the elders (1 Cor. 11, 30. 12, 9. James 5, 14.), who were endued with a power of discerning in what cases their gifts of healing should be bestowed; and whether or not (according to the nature of the offence, or the

offender,) the sin committed was a sin unto death." The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Benson: "For instance, if a Christian, by an impulse of the spirit, perceives that any Christian brother has sinned such a sin as to draw down upon himself a disease, which is not to end in death; but to be miraculously cured by him; then let him pray to God, and God, in answer to his prayer, will grant life and perfect health unto such Christians as have sinned a sin, which is not to end in death. There is a sin which draws down a disease, upon Christians, that is to end in death. I do not say, or mean, that any Christian shall pray for that; because in such a case God would not hear his prayer, nor miraculously cure his Christian brother at his request. Every unrighteousness is such a transgression of the divine law, as offends God. But all sins are not equally heinous and aggravated. And, consequently, they do not draw down equal punishment upon men. For a greater sin is unto death, whilst a lesser sin is not unto death."

Ἀμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν is thought to be a Hebraism; but I find it in Eurip. Hippol. 20. τιν' ἡμάρτηκεν εἰς σ' ἁμαρτίαν;

18. οἶδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει. By ὁ γεγ. ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant the (true) son of God, in opposition to those who sin unto death. The expression has been before explained. Ἀμαρτ. must be understood (as often before) of habitual and deliberate sin. It may be rendered: "does not *practise* wickedness." Τηρεῖ ἑαυτὸν, carefully keepeth himself (from such base and unworthy conduct)." Τηρ. is a very strong term. Carpz. refers to Hesych. τηρεῖ. φρονεῖ. And he compares Eph. 6, 11. Rosenm. compares James 1, 27. ἀσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν. Καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ "and so the evil Being touches him not (so as to hurt him)." The Commentators are agreed, that by ἅπτεθαι is, per litoten, here meant to *hurt* and *destroy*, as Joh. 9, 19., for the Hebr. נגג. See more in Elsn., or Bens. and Slade. The general sentiment is, that the true Christian does not *practise* sin; as in a kindred passage at 3, 9. πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος—γεγέννηται, where there is the same *repetition* of γεγενν., meant to draw the attention to that *point of doctrine*.

19. οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμεν. The connection and sense seems to be this: "And it is no wonder that we who are true Christians, should thus keep ourselves from sin, *for* we assuredly know that we are of God, are his children, and that the world at large lieth

under the dominion of the evil one." Hence sin, though it may be naturally expected from *them*, were highly inconsistent in *us*." Many, indeed, take τῷ πονηρῷ as a neuter, though, as Grot. admits, with *allusion* to the masculine. But the masculine is required both by the preceding verse, and the present one, and it yields the stronger sense. So Pisc., Camer, Beza, Zeg., Vorst., Gom., Est., Calvin, Bens., &c. The phrase κείσθαι ἐν may, indeed, be (according to Classical use) more agreeable to the neuter (and Rosenm. cites Eurip. Andr. ἐν κακοῖς κείσθαι and Seneca, Ep. 59. in vitiis jacuimus); yet κείσθαι ἐν τινι sometimes signifies, to lie under the power of, and be subject to any one. Thus Raphel cites from Polyb. 6, 6, 13. ἐν τοῦ συγκλήτῳ κείται. And other examples I could myself adduce.

20. οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι—διανοίαν, "We, moreover, assuredly know that the Son of God (the Messiah) is come, and hath given us this understanding, that we may know him that is true (i. e. the true God, and the most acceptable way of obeying and worshipping him). And indeed we are *in union with* the true God, by means of his Son Jesus Christ." Ἦκει, for ἦκεν. So we say, *is* come. With respect to the *understanding*, that was communicated by the preaching of the Apostles. Τὸν ἀληθινόν, THE TRUE Being, Deum Optimum Maximum. So Joh. 17, 5. τὸν μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν. See also 1 Thess. 1, 9. The Θεόν added in some MSS. is doubtless from the margin. In *knowledge* (the best Commentators are agreed), is here included *worship* and *obedience*. The nature of the *union* here mentioned has been before explained. The ἐν in ἐν τῷ υἱῷ is by most rendered *in*, as in the former clause. But the best Commentators from Grot. to Rosenm. assign to it the sense *per*. And so Tyndale. Certainly this sense is more apt: and Bens. has shown from several examples that ἐν may have two significations in the same sentence.

20. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. This has been, by most Commentators and Theolo-

gians antient and modern, considered as a complete proof of the deity of Christ. That life and *eternal* life are by the sacred writers perpetually ascribed to Christ, as the author, is certain; and the words are no where applied to God the Father. It is by some, however, thought more agreeable to the context to refer the *οὐτός*, not to the immediate antecedent, but to *αὐτοῦ*. And so Grot., Clarke, Bens., Wets., Rosenm., Schleus., and most recent Interpreters. There is supposed to be an elliptical expression for *οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, καὶ (αὐτῇ) ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος*; (as Joh. 17, 3.) or *καὶ (ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ) ἡ αἰώνιος*. The *former* is preferable, and though by Slade accounted not as a natural construction, yet it may be admitted in such a writer as St. John, where many constructions are harsh and anomalous. Upon the whole, no certain determination can be formed on the sense.

21. φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, “guard against, and cautiously avoid every kind and degree of idolatry,” whatever partakes of and approaches to it.” See Bens. Ἀμήν. This is equivalent to, “I heartily wish and pray that ye may do so.”

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN.

THE style and sentiments of this Epistle plainly show it to be St. John's; and if it was, at first, not received into the canon, that was from its brevity, and its being addressed only to one family.

VER. 1. ὁ πρεσβύτερος. This is often a noun of dignity. Hence some have fancied the writer to be *another* John, presbyter of Ephesus, mentioned by Papias ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 3, 29. But *πρεσβ.* may very well have the sense *διδάσκαλος*. It may,

too, import *senior grandævus* (sub Ἀπόστολος); for John was undoubtedly then the senior Apostle (being ninety-seven), and long survived all the others. Thus he might very properly be called ὁ πρεσβύτερος κατ' ἐξοχὴν. And, as Carpz. observes (from whom the above is chiefly derived), all churches of Christians, if they heard any one called ὁ πρεσβύτερος, although the *name of John* were not added, yet would not fail to know that *he* was meant. For he was not only the senior Apostle but most probably the senior *Christian*. And that St. John (from his characteristic modesty) was accustomed to suppress his name, we find from his Gospel 13, 19 & 26, 21, 20."

On the controverted and indeterminable question concerning the expression ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ (of which *four* interpretations have been proposed) it may suffice to refer the reader to Carpz., and especially Slade, by whom the subject is ably treated. He seems right in preferring the common interpretation; but I cannot agree with him, that the *article* is *improper*, which, though it is not in the text, is *understood*, and *ought* therefore to be *expressed*, since it would have reference to the address or direction which contained the name. Besides, the very epithet ἐκλ. seems to require it. This is rendered by Rosenm. *carissima*. But that is too feeble a sense. By Mackn., *excellent*. Possibly (as this seems to have been a person of some distinction) he thought the expression equivalent to the common address, *most excellent*, and *excellency*. But that were confounding antient and modern phraseology. The sense seems to be: "to the truly *Christian* Lady." And so many eminent Commentators, as Schleus. and Bens.

1. οὗς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. The οὗς may very well be supposed to refer to both the children and the mother, or to the latter only. See Slade. Now as to the *children*, it will not (as Rosenm. observes) prove that they were all *males*; since by τὰ τέκνα at

1 Pet. 3, 6. are denoted both sons and daughters. It will, however, prove that some, probably the *greater* number, were males; or if not, as the Apostle chose to employ a word referring to either gender, he could not, if there were *any* males, do otherwise than use the masculine, as being what grammarians call the *worthier* gender.

Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is an adverbial phrase for ἀληθῶς. As there is no article, it is not well rendered by our translators *in the truth*; though immediately after the Apostle uses ἀληθείᾳ *with* the article, in the sense of *the Gospel*. Such changes are common in St. John.

2. διὰ τὴν—αἰῶνα. This is closely connected with the preceding. “We (I say) love you because of the truth (i. e. the true religion) which remaineth in us, and will ever remain;” i. e. by hypallage, “in which we continue and will ever continue.”

3. ἔσται—Θεοῦ πατρὸς. Future for optative, by Hebraism. Χάρις and ἔλεος are used, by metonymy of the effect for the cause, to denote all the blessings attendant on the true profession of the Gospel. And the εἰρήνη παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς is exegetical of the preceding. See Col. 1, 1. 1 Thess. 1, 1. 2 Thess. 1, 2. 1 Tim. 1, 2. 2 Tim. 1, 2. Tit. 1, 4., &c. Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ, i. e. (as Grot. and Rosenm. explain) “by knowledge of the truth, and mutual love.” For by these we preserve and increase God’s benefits.

4. ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι—ἀληθείᾳ, “I have rejoiced (or I do rejoice) greatly, because I have found some of your children living in (the profession and practice of) the truth, as we have it revealed to us (through Jesus Christ) by God the Father.” It is, very probably, conjectured that these children were some whom business had brought over to Ephesus, and whom the Apostle, by conversation and society, had found in the right path. And this is supported by a kindred passage at 3 John 3. If such be the case,

this cannot (as some fancy) glance at other children who were not so.

5. καὶ νῦν—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. See a kindred sentiment at 1 Joh. 2, 7 & 8. and 10, 11 & 16. Ἐρωτῶ, *beseech*. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, “from the first promulgation of the Gospel.” The ἐρωτῶ—ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν (which is said to be a delicate mode of expression for ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἀγάπητε) ought, consistently with *our* ideas, to be rendered: “I beseech thee, let us love each other, cultivate mutual love.”

6. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη—αὐτοῦ. The idiom in αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, frequently occurs in the first Epistle and in the Gospel. It has been doubted whether by ἡ ἀγάπη we are to understand the *love of God*, to be shown by keeping his commandments (as Joh. 14, 15 & 21. 23, 24. 15, 10. 1 Joh. 2, 5. 5, 3.), or *love towards one another*, which God has by Christ enjoined on us; as Joh. 13, 34 & 35. 15, 12 & 13. Rom. 13, 8, 9, & 10. 1 Joh. 3, 23. 4, 21. Bens. fixes on the *latter*; but Grot. and Rosenm., the former; and with reason, since true love of God *includes* a love of our neighbour. By *the commandment from the beginning* is meant *mutual love*. The Apostle means, that “this is his commandment,” which is, therefore, to be obeyed.

7. ὅτι πολλοὶ—σαρκί. Carpz. and Rosenm. regard this verse as the *protasis*, and the next as the *apodosis*: and so the ὅτι, they say, may be rendered *because*, or be omitted. But I prefer supposing a connection between this and ver. 3., regarding ver. 4—6. as parenthetical; q. d. “(I rejoiced that you and your children walked in the truth, and I cannot but exhort you to continue so to do) *for* many deceivers are abroad in the world, who will not allow that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh.” Πλάνοι, “false teachers.” For εἰσῆλθον some MSS. read ἐξελθ., which is confirmed by the first Epistle 2, 19. Ἐρχόμενον is the participle imperfect. Ἐρχ. ἐν σαρκί, i. e. “came with the real human nature,” as opposed to

a mere phantasm. See the note on 1 Joh. 4, 2 & 3. On ὁμολ. see the note on 1 Joh. 4, 2.

7. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος, "That person is the kind of deceiver I mean." This change from the plural to the singular is (Carpz. observes) frequent in St. Joh. See his examples, and compare 1 Joh. 2, 18. 5, 16. Or οὗτος may, as Beza, Glass, and others think, be for πᾶς τοιοῦτος, "every such person."

8. βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς—ἀπολάβωμεν. Βλέπω is here, as often, used for φυλάσσω. See Schl. Lex. It is rarely found, as here, with an accusative; q. d. "mind yourselves, take heed to yourselves." Ἴνα μὴ ἀπολέσωμεν—ἀπολάβωμεν, "that we (your teachers) lose not what we had laboured for, but that we may receive our reward." The var. lect. ἀπολέσητε ἃ ἐργάσασθε, is doubtless an *emendation*. The textual reading must be retained, as being the more difficult, and supported by many similar passages of the New Testament, which represent teachers as receiving in proportion to the progress of the taught, and as being dishonoured by any disgrace attending them. See Bens. It is strange that Carpz. should recognise a κοίνωσις; a figure *here* inapplicable, and seldom used by St. John, though often by St. Paul.

The μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβωμεν, is very vaguely interpreted by Commentators. It must mean, "that reward which we shall receive, if ye continue steadfast." But the πλήρη seems to hint at some reward which the teacher would receive in the *other* case; which indeed were but just, since disciples may apostatize, and bring discredit to the master, without his being to blame. It may therefore (as Mr. Slade thinks) refer to the joy and satisfaction which they would naturally derive from the complete success of their labours.

9. πᾶς ὁ παραβαίνων—οὐδὲν ἔχει. At παραβαίνων must be supplied τὴν διδαχὴν. Rosenm. refers to Hebr. 2, 2., where the term is thus used absolutely. And he might have compared 1 Thess. 4, 8. ὁ ἀθετῶν. The

Apostle alludes to the false teachers above mentioned, who had corrupted the Gospel, by misrepresenting the character of Jesus. *Μένων ἐν τῇ διδ.*, for *ἐμμ.* or *διαμ.* *Θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει*, “holds not God in proper regard.” Thus 1 Thess. 4, 8. *ὁ ἀβετεῶν—ἀθετεῖ τὸν Θεόν*. Now this implies a loss of communion with him, and favour from him. See the note on 1 Joh. 2, 23.

10. *εἴ τις ἔρχεται—μὴ λέγετε*, “If any (teacher) come to you, and bring not (i. e. teach not) this doctrine (namely of Christ), receive him not into your house, nor say unto him, God speed thee.” Some Commentators think that this matron whom the Apostle is addressing, was a *Deaconess*, and received stranger Christians into her house, entertaining them at the *expense of the church*. But then the admonition would have been rather suited to the *Presbyters* and others who superintended the funds for such purposes. It seems more probable (as Bens. supposes) that she was a person of some property and distinction, who was in the habit of showing kindness and hospitality to Christian strangers, especially teachers.

10. *χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε*. A form of salutation expressive of *friendly feelings*. But as the receiving any such teacher into her house, and addressing such a salutation, could not but imply some degree of approbation and countenance to his doctrines, so it is forbidden by the Apostle; though by no means out of any uncharitable disposition towards such persons, as *men*. As to the Jewish custom of not coming within four cubits of the heretic, here adduced by Lightfoot, &c., it has nothing to do with the case in question. See Whitby, Bens., and Dodd., and also Slade.

11. *ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτῷ χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς*. Here is subjoined the *reason*, which is sufficiently plain: for hospitable reception implies regard and approbation, and would, in some measure, make any one answerable for the mischief

such persons might do by means of that countenance. I would compare Eurip. Med. 661. See Mackn. or Slade.

12. οὐκ ἠβουλήθη διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος, “I would not write (i. e. express my thoughts) by paper and ink.” This seems a sort of proverbial phrase. The word *χάρτης* is the Latin *charta* Grecized. Rosenm. observes, that it occurs in Hesych. in *v. τόμος*, but in no other Glossary. Ἐλθ. πρὸς ὑμᾶς seems a popular expression. Στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι is a proverbial one. The Commentators compare a similar one in Hebr. But, if I am not mistaken, it occurs in the *Classical* writers; though I have only noted down Synes. 169. Α. συνεῖναι σοι κατὰ πρόσωπον. Πεπληρωμένη, *complete*; as far as it would be so by conversation rather than by letter. See Mackn. and Slade.

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN.

VER. 1. ὁ πρεσβύτερος. See the note on ver. 1. of the foregoing Epistle. Γαίος is the Roman name *Caius*, which was a very common one. See Rosenm. and Mackn., or Slade. Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is for ἀληθῶς; as 2 Joh. 1.

2. περὶ πάντων—ψυχῇ, “above all things I heartily wish and pray that thou mayest be prospered, and enjoy health of body, even as thy soul prospereth.” The περὶ may be construed either with εὐχομαι, or with εὐοδ. In the former case it will be for ὑπερ, “above all things;” in the latter, for ἐν πᾶσι, i. e. all things regarding the eternal state, especially *health*, the principal one, which is here mentioned. But the former seems the more natural mode of

interpretation; and it is adopted by Schleus., to whose examples I add Pind. Ol. 6, 84. *περὶ θνητῶν, ante omnes mortales.* Εὐοδοῦσθαι properly signifies “to be set well forward on one’s way;” 2. “to go in one’s way aright;” 3. “to be prosperous;” as here and Rom. 1, 10. εἴπως πότε εὐοδαθήσομαι, where see the note. Rosenm. explains as if the Apostle were only wishing Caius the “*mens sana in corpore sano* :” a sort of sentiment more suited to a Heathen philosopher than a Christian Apostle. This *mens sana* may be very consistent with an utter neglect of the soul, and our immortal interests.

3. ἐχάρην γὰρ λίαν—περιπατεῖς. The use of the genitive absolute in this sense (i. e. when thy brethren came) is unusual. Μαρτυρούντων σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, is a brief and popular phrase for, “bearing testimony that thou walkest in the truth.” The words following are exegetical, and καθὼς simply signifies ὅτι, *namely, that.* So our old English *as how.* Compare a parallel passage in 2 Joh. 4.

4. μειζοτέραν τούτων—περιπατοῦντα. The τούτων, scil. πραγμάτων, is for τούτου. The ἵνα, Rosenm. says, is for ἡ ἵνα. But for the ἡ there is no occasion. Otherwise it is omitted in the best writers. Τέκνα, *spiritual children, disciples.* See 1 Tim. 1, 2 & 18. 2 Tim. 2, 2. Μειζοτέραν is a provincial form for μείζονα. Rosenm. compares with it χειριστοτέρῃ in Hippocr. and ἐσχατώτεραν in Aristotle. But those forms are of a different nature.

5, 6. πιστὸν ποιεῖς, sub. ἔργον. By πιστ. is meant “an action worthy of the faith,” i. e. the Gospel. Wets. adduces an example of ποιεῖν πιστὰ. But that is in another sense. Rosenm., more aptly, compares Liban. : οὐχ Ἑλληνικὴν τούτο ποιεῖς, “worthy of a Grecian.” Schleus. classes this passage with Tit. 1, 6. τέκνα ἔχων πιστὰ. The εἰάν is for ἂν. In καὶ τοὺς ξένους, the καὶ signifies *even.* The var. lect. καὶ ταῦτα εἰς ξένους, is doubtless *ex emendatione.* Now other Christians might show hospitality to those brethren whom they *knew*, (for we are not consider-

ing *public* hospitality shown by the Deacons to all Christians); but Caius showed it to those who were *strangers* to him.

6. οἱ ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας. These words are parenthetical. By ἐκκλησιᾶς. the Commentators understand the *Ephesian* church. But it may designate the church Catholic. Οὓς καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμψας ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. literally, “whom sending forward, and helping on their way, thou wilt do well, and worthy of God.” On προπέμπω I have before treated. See Tit. 3, 1. Ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ. This is obscurely rendered by our translators, “after a godly sort.” Better by Pisc. and Rosenm., “as becomes those who serve God, and agreeably to our duty to Him to whom we owe every thing.” See Col. 1, 10. 1 Thess. 2. 12.

7. ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐξῆλθον, μηδὲν λαμβάνοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, “For, for the sake of his name, or religion, they went forth, taking nothing from the Gentiles.” Some MSS. after ὀνόματος add αὐτοῦ, which, at all events, must be *supplied*: for it seems harsh to take ὄνομ. for *Christ*, i. e. the Christian religion; as does Rosenm. The construction which some lay down, ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, is extremely harsh, and the sense thence arising unauthorized and not agreeable to the context. According to the common mode of interpretation, as Bens. observes (whom see), there is a close connection with the verse following. And this “taking nothing” from their Gentile converts, was agreeable to the custom of St. Paul. The whole is well rendered by our translators. Ἐξῆλθον is used *absolutely*. We are to understand not so much, “from among Christians (with many Commentators),” as, “from their homes and their business.” Ἐλαμβάνοντες is for ἀπολαμβ.

8. ἡμεῖς οὖν ὀφείλομεν—ἀληθείᾳ. The *we* does *not* (I conceive) denote (as Benson thinks) *Jewish* Christians, but Christians in general, meaning such as are in stated abodes. Ἀπολαμβ. is for ὑπολαμβ., “receive with hospitality.” And so some MSS.; but

perhaps ex emendatione. "ἵνα συνεργοὶ γ. τ. ἀ., "that we may co-operate with those that propagate the truth (i. e. the Gospel), by furthering it all in our power." So in 2 Cor. 1, 25., we have συνεργοὶ εἶναι τῆς χαρᾶς.

9. ἔγραψα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, i. e. to the church to which Caius belonged. The ἔγραψα is well rendered, by Benson and others, "I had written;" which is preferable to reading ἔγραψα ἂν, *I would have written*, which requires a harsh subaudition. The *subject* of the writing is supposed to have been to recommend the brethren above-mentioned to the Gentiles. But without knowledge of the circumstances no certainty can be attained. Ὁ φιλοπρ. αὐτῶν is for αὐτῆς, by the figure πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον; ἐκκλησίας being a noun of multitude. Whether this Diotrophes was a Presbyter, or a Deacon, is not known. The former is the more probable. As to the conjectures respecting him, they are founded on no evidence, and merit little attention. Οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. By ἡμᾶς is, of course, meant *me John*: but whether it signifies "*my person*," or my *Apostolical office*, or my *admonitions* and recommendations, Commentators are not agreed. It must chiefly refer to his *office*, but, in a secondary sense, to his admonitions. Οὐκ ἀποδέχεσθαι τινα seems to have been a proverbial expression; signifying "to have nothing to do with a person," meaning that we reject his interference. It is probable that Diotrophes, as Presbyter, refused to receive the letter, thereby declining to receive St. John's directions, or recognize his Apostolical authority. Thus there is every reason to suppose him to have been one of the false teachers.

10. ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖ, λ. π. φ. ἡ. Ὑπομιμνήσκειν properly signifies only to *remember*: but it is often used by those who modestly suppress part of their meaning, to denote "remember to *do* any thing, whether good or evil." So Luke 23, 42. "remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom," and Gal. 2, 10. "remember the poor." See

also Heb. 13, 3 & 7. We have the very same idiom; too, in our own language. Thus here the sense is: "I will remember (to reprove and punish his presumption and irregularity)." So Carpzov explains; comparing 2 Cor. 13, 2. ἐὰν ἔλθω οὐ φείσομαι. This is greatly preferable to rendering it *admonish*, with Grot. and Rosenm.; a mode of interpretation which seems to have been adopted, to elude the objection that remembrance of injuries was unworthy of an Apostle: but Whitby has completely overturned that cavil.

10. λόγοις πονηροῖς φλυαρῶν ἡμᾶς. Φλυαγέω is properly a verb neuter, signifying to *blow bubbles*, *trifle*, and also to *chatter*, *prate*: and as by φλύαροι are denoted praters in 1 Tim. 5, 13., so it is justly thought that φλυαγέω here signifies to *chatter against*, i. e. to calumniate any one by false and vain words.

The οὔτε—καὶ may seem harsh (though the Commentators notice it not); but it may be observed that it often occurs in Thucyd. I would write οὐ τε—καὶ. On the καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει it is no easy matter to determine whether there be here meant those that received the strangers, or the strangers themselves. The *former* is certainly more agreeable to the common rules of construction; yet as ἐκβ. ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, if so applied, can signify nothing short of *excommunication*, which we can hardly suppose even Diotrephes would denounce against those who received Christian strangers, I am strongly inclined to adopt the *latter* interpretation, which is supported by Heumann, Carpzov, Rosenm., Jaspis, and other recent Commentators, viz. to *reject* them, not receive them as Christians into the society of Christians there, and, by denying them any support, thus compel them to depart and go elsewhere. It would, moreover (though the Commentators have not observed it), much clear the sense, if the words καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους κωλύει were put into a parenthesis. And the καὶ may be rendered *imo*. Thus no objection will remain to this interpretation.

11. μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν; q. d. “ imitate not the evil example of Diotrephes, but the good one of the others. ‘Ο ἀγαθοποιῶν, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ κακοποιῶν οὐχ εἰώρακε τὸν Θεόν. The Apostle now changes the *special* admonition into a *general* one. The sense is: “ He who practises what is good is (a son) of God; he who practises any sort of evil, doth not (really) know God or religion, because by his actions he shows he is not sensible of his obligations to virtue.” On the import of the phrases see 1 Joh. 2, 29. 3, 6. I would observe that there is a remarkable var. lect. (which has escaped all the Commentators) to be found in Gregor. Corinth. in Hermog. p. 904. med. (Orat. Græc. Reisk 8.) τέκνια, πᾶς ἀγαθοποιὸς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ κακοποιὸς οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἐστίν. And a little after he adds: διὰ τὸ λυπηρὸν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, οὐκ εἶπε σαφῶς, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκε αὐτὸ τοῖς βουλόμενοις ἔξωθεν νοεῖν.

12. Δημήτριος μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων, καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας. This Demetrius is thought to have been one of the principal of those whom St. John had recommended to Caius. Μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων, “ has a testimony (for good) borne to him by all (who know him).” In this absolute sense μαρτ. frequently occurs. So Acts 16, 2. ὃς ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Αὐστροῖς, &c. See also the note on Heb. 11, 2, Καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀληθείας. An *acutè dictum*, which must not be pressed upon. The τῆς αὐτῆς ἀληθείας is well explained, by Carpzov, *re ipsâ*. So Rosenm.: “ Non hominum tantum, sed et veritatis ipsius testimonio ornatur: non solum dicitur esse, sed et est bonus.” And he might have cited the Æschylean Οὐ δοκεῖν ἀριστὸς, ἀλλ’ εἶναι θέλει.

12. μαρτυροῦμεν, scil. αὐτῷ. Some interpret: “ We and the others of the Church at Ephesus.” But it is sufficient to understand the *Apostle*. The next words καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθὴς ἐστι are aptly compared with Joh. 19, 35., &c.; and it is hence (as well as from other passages) satisfactorily proved that St. John was the author of the Epistle.

13, 14. See the note on a kindred passage at 2 Joh. 12, 15. Εἰρήνη σοι. A Hebrew form of address. So לְ שָׁלוֹם. Οἱ φίλοι. Mackn. explains, *the Christians*. And he observes that this is the only example of the appellation found in Scripture. But I should doubt even *this* one. The article seems to stand for the pronoun: “your friends (and mine) salute thee.” Τοὺς φίλους must mean “our friends.” All these were doubtless *Christians*.

THE
GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. δοῦλος—Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This appellation is not inconsistent with *Apostleship*: for St. Paul sometimes uses the δοῦλος *by itself*, (and so James 1, 1.); at other times, in conjunction with ἀποστ.; as Phil. 1, 1. Ἀδελφός Ἰακώβου. He makes mention of *James*, his brother, as being well known, and of great influence among the Jewish Christians. (Rosenm.) Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ—κλητοῖς. By the κλητοὶ are meant *Christians*. And the ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγιασμένοι are what St. Paul, at 1 Cor. 1, 2. calls ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. The var. lect. ἡγαπ. seems to be a gloss. Now the term ἡγ. being so general, proves that it was addressed to Christians of every kind. See Mackn. and Slade.

2. ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη, “May mercy, and peace, and love abundantly be your portion.” Now ἔλεος and εἰρήνη (which denote mercy and acceptance from God, and peace with him) are mentioned as being the choicest of spiritual blessings; and ἀγάπη, or *mutual love*, which is the very bond of peace, as being the most promotive of temporal happiness. On πληθ. see 1 Pet. 1, 2.

3. ἀγαπητοὶ, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος—ἀγίοις πίστει, “Brethren, when I thus made it my earnest business to write unto you concerning the common salvation, I thought it needful to insert an exhortation that you should zealously strive for the preservation of the faith which has been, once for all, delivered

to the saints." The expression *πάσαν σπουδὴν π.* is a very strong one. Of *itself* *σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι* (not *ποιεῖν*, as Rosenm. has it) signifies to *use all one's diligence*. It is nearly equivalent to *σπουδάζειν*. One may compare the *σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισφέρειν* of 2 Pet. 1, 10. On *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας* Pric. and Wets. adduce several passages. The most apposite is 2 Macc. 9, 21. *ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην φροντίσαι τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἀσφαλείας*. In the rest of the passages *σωτηρία* denotes *temporal preservation*; while here it signifies *eternal salvation*, or the means of attaining it, namely, the Christian religion. See the note on Philem. 5. *Ἀναγκαῖον ἔσχον, necesse duxi*, savours of Latinism. *Ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τὴν πίστει*, i. e. *ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει*. An agonistical metaphor. So Sir. 4, 28. *ἀγώνισαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*. The sense here is, to earnestly strive for the preservation of the true faith, in opposition to false doctrines. The *ἀπαξ* is, by most Commentators, rendered *olim*, i. e. at the beginning of the Gospel. And so Carpz. and Hanl. compares Philo T. 2, 387. *τοῖς ἀπαξ παραδοθείσι*. Others, as Schleus., explain it *omnino, perfectè*. But this seems not so proper a sense as the former. There may, however, be also an allusion to the doctrine being propounded *once for all*, and admitting of no change.

4. *παρεισέδυσαν—ἀσεβεῖς*. The Apostle now assigns the *reason* why such care was necessary to preserve the purity of the faith. *Παρεισέδυσαν*. *Παρά*, which properly signifies *by*, has here the sense of *by the by, covertly*. See Elsner, Krebs, Kypke, and especially Wets. The words *ἄνθρωποι οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα* are regarded by Pric. and Bens. as parenthetical, and exegetical. But it is too violent to separate *τινες* from *ἄνθρωποι*; nor is it necessary, since the sense arising is much the same. The *οἱ πάλαι πρ. ἐ. τ. τ. κ.* is rendered by Bens., "and who were long ago described as persons who should come under this condemnation." By Rosenm.: "men on whom God long decreed this pu-

nishment.” Κεῖμα for κατάκριμα, *condemnation*, which involves the sense of *punishment*. The προγεγ. is thought, by Rosenm., to allude to the custom of judges putting certain persons on a list for execution; and it signifies (he adds), in a general way, to *proscribe*. He compares 2 Pet. 2, 3. οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεῖ, &c. The τοῦτο, he thinks, is for ὅμοιον, παραπλήσιον. Rather, (I would say,) for τοιοῦτο. There is, no doubt, reference to the examples following in ver. 5—7. It is meant that the punishment which formerly befel the Israelites, or the rebel angels, or Sodom, such a punishment awaits *them*.

4. τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσελγείαν, “who turn the gracious dispensation of the Gospel (meant to encourage virtue and exertion, and promote holiness) into an occasion for lasciviousness.” Compare 1 Pet. 2, 16. For examples of this sense of *grace* Benson refers to 1 Pet. 2, 16. Acts 13, 43. 2 Cor. 6, 1. Tit. 2, 11. Heb. 12, 15. Now the original intention (says he) of the grace of God in the Gospel, was to promote all manner of purity or holiness. Luke 1, 74 & 75. Rom. 2, 3., &c. Eph. 1, 4. & 2, 10. 1 Thess. 4, 7. Tit. 2, 11 & 12. 1 Joh. 1, 7. But, because God was merciful to the penitent, they represented his mercy as boundless, and equally extended unto those who wallowed in lewdness and all manner of vice.” Μετατίθεσθαι signifies to change, to alter a thing from its original purpose. Thus here it denotes the abusing religion to lasciviousness. So Apulej., cited by Pric. (speaking of a Christian woman); “Mentita sacrilegia præsumptione Dei quem prædicaret unicum, matutino mero, et continuo stupro corpus manciparat.” It is observed by Rosenm., that the false teachers against whom Jude inveighs were the same with those so strongly censured by Peter and John.

4. καὶ τὸν μόνον—ἀρνούμενοι. Rosenm. compares 2 Joh. 7. Tit. 1, 16. 2 Pet. 2, 1. and the notes. He also observes that ἀρνεῖσθαι here comprehends both deeds and words. See more in Slade.

5. ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότες ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ τοῦτο. There has been much debate on the signification of ἅπαξ, which is variously interpreted. Some refer it to εἰδότες, and render it *omnino*. Others take it to belong to the δεύτερον following, in the sense, that God once indeed led his people from Egypt, but afterwards destroyed the unbelieving. Thus the τὸ δεύτερον, which just after follows, will not be without its antitheton. Finally, the words ἅπαξ τοῦτο may be connected with ὑπομνήσαι, thus: ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ἅπαξ τοῦτο, καὶ πέρ εἰδότες ὑμᾶς. (Rosenm.) They may be rendered: "I recall to your remembrance what you have once heard." Ἀπαξ does not signify *primâ vice*; nor is it opposed to δεύτερον, *secundâ vice*: but δεύτερον signifies *postea, deinceps*; and ἅπαξ is to be rendered *jampridem, dudum*, and is to be referred to εἰδότες. "From your earliest years these histories have been known to you; now recall them again to your remembrance." (Carpz.) The τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας Grot. takes for ἀπειθήσαντας; since those that obey not, show that they do not *believe* as they ought. So in Hebr. 4, 2., the word is said not to have been mixed with faith, &c. And, as Whitby says, unbelief was the cause of their apostacy and all their sins. "This *destruction* (says Rosenm.) was effected in various ways; by serpents, by diseases, by the Angel, by the hands of the Levites, &c. Now it is hinted, that God will also give up to destruction those who, after professing the Christian faith, deny their Lord Jesus Christ."

6. ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν.

On the sense of τὴν ἀρχήν there is some doubt. Some, as Grot., Beza, and most early Commentators, explain, "their first state." Others, as Menoch., Bens., and, of the recent Commentators, Schleus. and Laurman., and especially Carpz., take it to mean *their original dignity*; i. e. "who preserved not their prerogatives as sons of God, and the original excellence with which they were created, the truth and holiness created with them." And so Cyril, cited by Carpz. For examples of this signification in the Classical writers, Schleus. refers to Irmisch on Herodian 2, 3, 9.

The ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον is explained by Grot. and

Rosenm., "left their proper habitation, heaven, and descended to the infernal regions." Laurman supposes a metaphor taken from fugitive slaves, who, absconding from their home, had afterwards assigned to them a much worse habitation. Bens. and Schleus. render the *οικτ.*, "their *proper situation* (proudly aspiring to a higher)." Thus the words will be exegetical of the preceding. And this, seems, upon the whole, the best mode of interpreting them. The *οικτ.*, Laurman observes, is a rare word. He refers to a passage of Plut., to which I add Joseph. 199, 7.

6. *εἰς κρίσιν*—*τετήρηκεν*, "he hath reserved in chains of darkness against the judgment of the great day." Compare a kindred passage of 2 Pet., 2, 4., where see the note. *Τηρεῖσθαι* is used for *φυλάττεσθαι*, Acts 25, 21. The *κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας* signifies the judgment, condemnation, and punishment of the great day. For *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*, 2 Pet., 2, 9., 3, 7., 1 Joh. 4, 17. This seems not so much an hypallage (which Rosenm. calls it) as a blending of two synonymous phrases, *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*, and *εἰς μεγάλην ἡμέραν*. On the *δεσμοὶ* and *αἶδ.* it is needless to speculate. *ὑπὸ ζόφον* see Bens. and Rosenm. I would here compare Soph. Antig. 948.

Hanlein thinks the story derived from the Apocryphal Books, and Jewish Mythology, and neither confirmed, nor rejected by the Apostle, who only makes use of the circumstances of the story as examples to show the Jews the miserable consequences of error and vice. But to this I must demur, as there is something unsound in the principle. And I shall here adduce the words of a profounder Theologian and an abler Scholar, Laurm. ad h. l. p. 49., "Admittendi mythi nullam video rationem; sed historiam arbitror verè gestam, nobis omnino incognitam. Unde tantæ tenebræ, haud facile discutiendæ, ob historiæ, priscae antiquitatis, inscitiam." He refers to C. Olear. Diss. de angelis desertoribus et captivis, ap. Thes. Nov. P. 2. p. 1008.

7. *ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα*—*ἐκπορεύσασαι*. The *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις* are the cities or towns *circum circa*, like the *περιοίκοι* of the Greeks (See Gen. 19, 25. Sept.), namely, Adama, Zeborm, and Zoar, which were subject to, and in the vicinity of, Sodom and Gomorrha, and participated in their vices. These shared in their punishment, except Zoar, which was spared at Lot's entreaty. The *towns*, it may be observed, are put (as often) for the *inhabitants*. The *ἐκ* in *ἐκπορν.* is (as often) intensive. The verb itself is used in the Sept. At *τρόπον* must be understood *κατὰ*. See Schleus. Lex. The *τούτοις* is by some referred to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha: by others, to the false teachers in question; by others again, to the *angels* above mentioned. The

first mode of interpretation seems to deserve the preference; and we may here suppose the figure *προς τὸ σημαινόμενον*. So Blackw. and Laurman. The words ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας are exegetical of the *πεπορν*. This expression, on which Commentators needlessly enlarge, is an euphemism, denoting adultery, sodomy, and other abominations, for which those cities were infamous. The use here of ἀπέρχεσθαι seems to have been idiotical, like our popular use of the expression *go after*.

Now, of these it is further said, *πρόκεινται δαίγματα*, i. e. *ὡς παράδειγμα*, or *ὑποδείγμα*, i. e. to succeeding ages (So 3 Macc., cited by Rosenm.): *σὺ—σοδομίτας πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ κατέφλεξας, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις καταστήσας*; or, as in 2 Pet., 2, 6., *τῶν μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν*. There (I would observe) *ἐνεκα* is understood; and *τῶν μελλ. ἂσ.* is put for *πᾶσι τοῖς μέλλουσι ἀσεβεῖν*. *Δίκην ὑπέχειν* is a common phrase denoting to *suffer punishment*. On the *πῦρ αἰώνιον* Commentators (I think) refine too much. Bens. explains it, a fire which burnt till it utterly consumed them. See Whitby. It is not necessary to press on the *αἰώνιον*. We need only suppose that the Apostle's meaning is: "they are publicly set forth (*προκ.*, which is a forensic term) for an everlasting example (in their fiery destruction) of the punishment God sometimes inflicts for sin in *this* world, and which is but a faint type of that which he hath reserved for the next." See Wells.

8. *ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι*, "In like manner (notwithstanding such awful examples of punishment are held out), these dreamers defile the flesh (with lewdness), set at nought government, and revile dignities." The antients, and most Commentators, from Erasm. downwards, fancy, in the *ἐνυπ.* an allusion to the obscene dreams of those vicious persons. But I agree with others, as Beza, Grot., Heins., Wolf, Pricæus, and the best Commentators, since their time, that the term here signifies *stulta imaginari*. It alludes (they think) to the dreaming

idle fancies of the false teachers, of whom Apulej. (cited by Pric.) says, *vigilantes somniant*. See Burnet ap. Johns. D. 17. And so in Cowper's Task. Bens. ap. Slade explains: "dreaming idle dreams, turning the grace of God into licentiousness, and promising themselves and their disciples security and lasting happiness in those courses, which the Gospel condemns." Carpz. and Rosenm. think there is an allusion to the lethargy of obdurate vice.

The *κυριοτ.* (as the best Commentators are agreed) denotes, not *angels*, but human governors. This term, like the Latin *potestas*, is used for the *persons* exercising the dominion. So the Italian *podesta*, a *governor*. Ἀθετεῖν, literally, signifies *in nullo loco habere*, to *set at nought*. So 2 Pet. 2, 11., καταφρονεῖν. The verb is used by Polyb., Diod. Sic., and Josephus, cited by Schleus., Lex. The σάρκα μιαινούσι alludes to fornication, adultery, and sodomy.

The *δόξας* is by some (even Schleus.) interpreted of *angels*. But Grot., and most other Interpreters, take it to denote the higher magistrates, as *κυριοτ.*, the lower. Laurman, however, thinks them synonymous. This term (like the *κυρ.* before) is put for the persons bearing the office.

9. ὁ δὲ Μιχαήλ—Κύριος.

Slade traces the connection thus: "The Gnostics imitate the fallen angels in their rebellious speeches and conduct; the archangel will afford them a better example, who, even under the greatest provocation, refused to pronounce a harsh sentence of condemnation against a fallen spirit." On the arch-angel Michael see Mackn. and others, and especially Laurman. Rosenm. thinks the Apostle derived the story from an Apocryphal book entitled ἀνάβασις τοῦ Μωσέως, mentioned by Origen. Œcumen. (cited by Rosenm.) gives the story thus: Λέγεται, τὸν Μιχαήλ τὸν ἀρχάγγελον τῇ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ταφῇ διικονηκέναι· Τοῦ δὲ διαβόλου τοῦτο μὴ καταδεχομένου, ἀλλ' ἐπιφέροντος ἔγκλημα διὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἀιγυπτίου φόνον, ὡς διὰ τοῦτο ἐνόχου ὄντος Μωϋσέως, καὶ μὴ συγχωρεῖσθαι τυχεῖν τῆς ἔντιμου ταφῆς, &c. which is the best commentary on this passage.

Διακρίνεσθαι τινι signifies to have a law-suit with, or, in a general way, to have a *dispute* with. Οὐκ ἐτόλμησε, non sustinuit, in animum induxit, could not bring himself. So Theogn. 369. (cited by Laurm.) See Schleus. Lex. Wassenburg ap. Laurm. paraphrases thus: "non ausus est ea quæ Deī erant, sibi arrogare, quanquam Archangelus." Κρίσιν βλασφημίας is for κρισι. βλάσφη-

μον, which occurs in 2 Peter 2, 11. Ἐπιφέρειν is a forensic term. Rosenm. thus states the argument: "If Michael scrupled to revile the Devil (an exalted angel the worst of dæmons), who himself, though impious, had received from God some power in the world, how can we excuse those who do not hesitate to revile human magistrates, nay even good angels." It is well observed by Doddr., that the argument rises from the detestable character of the devil; q. d. "If the angel did not rail even against the devil, how much less ought we against men in authority, even supposing them in some things to behave amiss." To do it therefore when they behave well, must be an offence yet much more aggravated.

9. Ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι Κύριος. The words are derived from Zach. 3, 2., but differently applied. Ἐπιτιμῶν carries with it (as often) a notion of *punishment* as well as *rebuke*.

On this story Rosenm. refers to a Dissertation on the verse in Pott's Syllog. Comment. 6, 170. seq. from which he makes an extract. But the more sound and judicious of my readers will prefer the following from the very learned and able Commentary on this Epistle by Laurman, which is a treasure of information on every point connected with it: "Judas historiam narrat, non mythum vid. locum de fonte doctrinæ Judæ. At ignoramus quam narrat historiam, et quo fonte petitam: et quod rei difficultatem auget, non omnem historiam narrat, at ex historiâ quippe tum temporis bene cognitâ fragmentum tantum delibavit." Finally, I agree with Mr. Slade, that it is difficult to believe an inspired Apostle would enforce or recommend his doctrine by a mere fable; and besides, he evidently mentions it not as a fable, but a fact; and the converts, at least, would conclude that he was persuaded of its truth.

10. οὗτοι δὲ, ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν, βλασφημοῦσιν. Compare 2 Pet. 2, 12. By the things they do not understand (i. e. the purpose and use of) are (as the best Commentators think) meant *laws* and *magistracies*. Schleus. and Laurman, however, explain: quæ nequeunt facere, scil. ex virium tenuitate. Δὲ, immo vero, whereas. "Ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς—φθείρονται, "but by those things which by natural instinct they know and feel, by those they corrupt themselves." Φυσικῶς, "by the natural instincts, the impulses of appetite and passion, and sensual pleasure;" partly such as is adverted to in the σάρκα μιν. ; and partly of gluttony, ascribed to them by the ἐαυτὸν ποιμαίνοντας at ver. 12. Φθείρονται, "abuse to their own injury." Passive for reciprocal. (Rosenm., partly from Grot.) Thus they abused the instinctive knowledge they possessed, to the destruction both of body and soul.

11. Hic non pœnam enarrat, sed vitia enumerat.

(Laurm.) Comparatione institutâ cum tribus improbis, Caïno, Balaamo, et Cora, qui in sacrâ scripturâ pessimè audiunt, falsis fratribus creat invidiam. Ipsa tamen facinorum, quæ commiserunt, convenientia non nimis est urgenda. (Wassenb. ap. Laurm.)

11. οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς. Non imprecatur, sed denunciat exitium. (Carpz.) Πορεύεσθαι ὁδῷ τινος signifies to follow any one's example. The points of resemblance are: 1. Hatred and persecution of the brethren, that disposition of mind which tends to *murder*. Thus every such person is in 1 Joh. 3, 15. called a murderer. (See the note there.) 2. Avarice. 3. Pride.

11. καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν, "They impetuously rush upon the sin committed by Balaam for the lucre of gain;" i. e. as he excited the people to whoredom with the Moabites, so they, through love of lucre, encourage Christians in carnal lusts. See Apoc. 2, 14 and 13. The ἐξεχ. is a strong term; and (as Laurman says) there is a metaphor derived from a river which breaks its banks, and inundates the country round. See Elsn., Kypke, &c. Laurm. cites Test. 12 Patr. ap. Grab. Spicileg. 1, 45, τοῦ μὴ πορευθῆναι ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ νεότητος καὶ πορνείᾳ, ἐν ᾗ ἐξεχύθη ἐγὼ. See Gen. 49, 4.

11. καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) καὶ ὡς ὁ Κορὲ ἀντιλέξας ἀπώλοντο. The ἀπώλοντο Rosenm. takes as aorist for future, or present. The latter method is greatly preferable. He adds: "As that sedition was against Moses, so was this against Christ and his religion." In a similar way ἀντιλογία is used in the Protevang. Jacobi c. 9. (cited by Laurm.) As examples of this spirit Carpz. refers to 3 Joh. 9. and 1 Cor. 1, 11. And he observes that these three, the ἐπορεύθησαν, ἐξεχύθησαν, and ἀπώλοντο, are used *gradatim* of a single life, and the perdition it brings with it.

12. οὗτοί εἰσιν—σπιλάδες. Οὔτοι, Laurm. remarks, is often used by St. Peter of those wretches whose crimes are so graphically depicted by himself and St. Jude, the latter of whom here presents an admirable

delineation, derived from things most obvious in nature, and which strikingly evinces his learning, taste, and power of eloquence.

“These wretches (says the Apostle) are spots and a disgrace to your love-feasts, when they feast with you to an excess which shows no reverence to God or regard to man.” By the ἀγαπ., *Agapæ*, are meant those sacred meals which at first, among the primitive Christians, preceded the Eucharist, and afterwards succeeded it, and to which all, especially the richer, furnished their contributions. Now these were at first frugal and sober, but became in process of time more luxurious; and the poor were generally excluded, while the rich, without restraint, gratified their appetites; until in the fourth century the custom was solemnly abolished by the counsel of Laodicea. These love-feasts, it may be observed, somewhat resembled the ἐράναι of the Greeks; a term similarly derived from ἐράω. See Athen. 362 E. and Lennep. Etym. Græc. in v. On feasts in general there is an apposite passage in Athen. 363 D.

Σπιλάδες. This word is often used in the Classical writers of denote rough and sharp rocks, partly jutting out of the sea, and concealed by it, around which breakers arise. Hence many eminent recent Commentators recognise an allusion to these false teachers who, like such rocks, are pernicious to those who meet with them; shipwreck the faith, and corrupt the morals of those who hold intercourse with them. So Laurm., who adduces similar expressions from Cicero. See also Wets. Such may possibly be the sense; but there seems something so incongruous in the figure, that I am inclined to retain the common interpretation, *spots*, in the same sense as the σπιῖλοι at 2 Pet.; especially as I am supported by such eminent critics as Beza, Grot., Hemsterh., Bens., Scheid, and Wassenburg. And this conveys a far more consistent and apposite sense.

As to the argument derived from the difference of the two forms σπιῖλος and σπιῖλας, that seems frivolous, as it regards St. Jude. The gloss of Hesych., which represents the antient opinion, is strongly in its favour. And so the Vulg. *maculæ*. And that the words sometimes (as Laurm. shows) interchange senses, rather countenances the common interpretation, which is, moreover, confirmed by the general idea which prevails in these two words, and many cognate ones. Σπίω is (I suspect) cognate with the Latin *spuo*, and our *spi-t*, and *sputt-er*, and *spot*; hence *spi-go*. Nay, even σπι-νθῆρ comes from σπι-ω or σπιζω, to *spurt* or *sprinkle*. Thus the leading sense is to *spit*. Now a *spot* is properly something *spit* out, and which stands out as a stain on any thing. And what are such rocks as those here meant but *spots* on the sea? for such they appear at a distance; and *why* they should be so called, it were as needless to enquire, as why rocks should be called χοιράδες. Fancy must have scope in either case.

Συνενωχούμενοι, ἀφ' ὧν αὐτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες. Pric. and Rosenm. connect the συνενωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, not with the preceding, but with

the following : and for ποιμαίνοντες they read ποιμαίνουσι, or take it for a participle. But there is no necessity for any change in the punctuation and construction ; and for a change in *reading*, no *authority*. The common reading and interpretation is preferable : and συνευχ. and ποιμαίνοντες are each a Nominativus pendens. The ἀφόβως most refer to the former ; but others, with more reason, to the latter. There is, too, a climax. It seems to mean, “with no fear or care but for themselves, with none for their fellows, or for the poor.” The ἐαυτοὺς is emphatical. Φόβος here signifies *anxious care*.

Νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι, ὑπὸ ἀνέμων περιφερόμεναι. See the note on 2 Pet. 3, 17. And consult Pric. in loc. “These *waterless clouds* (says Rosenm.) are fit emblems of the false teachers, who promised much of evangelical truth and purity, but furnished little worthy of the title ; q. d. “As clouds carried about in the air, but devoid of water, do not nourish the earth, so these boasters hurry about, promising much, but performing little, nay, infecting rather than irrigating the minds of the faithful.” This, however, may be pushing the comparison a little too far.

Δένδρα φθινοπωρινά, “trees as they are at the end of Autumn, without leaves or fruit.” So most Commentators explain. But these false teachers may be said to have had *leaves*, if they had not *fruit*. I therefore prefer supposing trees as they are towards the end of Autumn, *with leaves*, but without fruit, i. e. promising, but not performing ; as in the case of the fig-tree, Mark 11, 13. Or we may, with many Commentators, understand trees whose early fruit (or buds) withereth, and never cometh to perfection, like fruit with a worm at the core. But this is denoted by the next word ἄκαρπα. And (I would observe) there seems to be a climax in δένδρα φθινοπωρινά, ἄκαρπα, δις ἀποθανόντα, ἐκριζώθεντα. The δις ἀποθανόντα is explained, by the best Commentators, “doubly, i. e. altogether dead.” But there seems an allusion to the preceding terms, which denote only those *barren* ; such only *thus far* living. See Benson, Slade, and Mackn. In the ἐκριζωθέντα we have the *apex* of the climax ; for of trees uprooted there can be no more hope of fruit. The application is obvious. See Laurm.

13. κύματα ἄγριαι θαλάσσης, ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἐαυτῶν αἰσχύνas, “rough, wild, raging waves of the sea, foaming out (only) their own shame.” The epithet ἄγριος is applied to various objects, but rarely to inanimate ones. The Commentators compare Sap. 14, 1., ἄγρια κύματα. The ἐπαφρίζοντα is usually rendered *despumantes*, *foaming out* (as if ἐξαφρ., which occurs in Æschyl. Agam. 1034., αἱματηρὸν ἐξαφρίζεσθαι μένος). But it should rather be, *foaming up*, i. e. on the shore : for the ἄφρον is not only the *foam* of the sea, but, as we find by the Schol. on Hom. Il. ο. 626., the τὸ χορτῶδες τῆς θαλάσσης, ἀπόβλημα, the *wreck*, or

sea-weeds, &c., thrown up on the shore by the sea. And this illustrates the *αἰσχύνας* just after. For, as the wreck is the refuse of the sea, so were the foolish and obscene discourses (for *αἰσχυνὰς* is rightly supposed by Rosenm. to denote the *αἰσχρολόγαι*, the filthiness and foolish talking, mentioned by St. Paul) which these persons spouted forth, their *shame*. Here Laurm. (after Alberti) cites Mosch. Idyll. 5, 5. p. 375., Edit. Valckn. : 'Αλλ' ὅταν ἀχίση πολὺς βυθὸς ἀδὲ θάλασσα Κυρτὸν ἐπαφρίδῃ (Br. ἐπαφρίσδῃ) τὰ δὲ κύματα μακρὰ μεμῆνῃ. This I had myself noted, and on which I would remark that there is, properly, a *lacuna* between κύματα and μεμῆνῃ. This, Valckn. has supplied by μακρὰ : a conjecture eagerly caught up by Wakef. ; but, I conceive, injudiciously. I would read κάρτα, which will (I think) meet with the approbation of the learned.

13. ἀστέρες πλανῆται, οἷς ὁ θόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετήρηται. Rosenm. supposes this expression to be used in allusion to the ἀστέρες διαθέοντες, with reference to the wandering unsettled habits of those teachers, ever on the watch to gratify their appetites. If so, the Apostle had perhaps in view the words of the Psalmist : " They will run here and there for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied." Now *stars* was (as Grot. observes) the name by which, among the Jews, teachers were designated. The *πλαν.* has no reference to the *planets*, but signifies *errones*. Thus Plato (cited by Tiren.) calls merchants (or rather pedlars) the *planetæ urbium*. On these *wandering stars* see Milton ap. Bens., and also Carpz. and Hanlein.

The rest of the phraseology is the same with 2 Pet. 2, 17., where see the note.

It is observed by Laurm., that these verses (12 and 13.), in exquisite beauty of imagery, elegance of expression, and force of wholesome admonition *reliquis palmam faciunt dubiam*. The passage is well imitated by Cowper, Task, p. 177., " Lust in their hearts."

14.—15. προεφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ. These verses Rosenm. takes to be parenthetical; the comparison begun at ver. 12 and 13, being continued at ver. 16.; and what is here said of Enoch, being introduced in order to show how heavy a judgment hung over the wicked. On Enoch, the seventh in lineage from Adam, and the book of Enoch (cited by some of the Fathers, and whose authority is defended by others), this is no place to treat; nor indeed is it a matter of much consequence, since (as Bp. Sherlock and others observe) it can by no means be proved that this is a quotation from that work; nor would it prove, in any case, the inspiration of the book from which it was taken, but only the truth of this particular passage, of which the Apostle was well qualified to judge, though it might be, as Slade thinks, a prophecy of Enoch's preserved by tradition. On Enoch see Laurm., from whom it appears that the great Dutch Divines, Ens. Munting, Patzt, &c., have of late come over to the opinion of the earlier Commentators (though abandoned by most of the later ones), that Enoch did not die, but really ascended to heaven alive; and that therefore the case affords a good *popular* argument for the immortality of the soul, and the rewards of virtue. And this opinion he himself embraces. He moreover truly remarks, that the style of this passage (so different from the terse phraseology of St. Jude's Epistle) bears strong marks of genuineness, i. e. of the earliest antiquity, and seems to have been faithfully followed by the Apostle, and translated, literally, from Hebrew into Greek.

The προεφήτευσε is rendered by Rosenm. *docuit*. But the word seems to have a middle signification between *propheesied*, and *foretold*. Nor is ἦλθε for the Future: but the Prophet uses the past tense, as if the Lord were already come. It may be rendered, *is come*. Ἐν μυριάσιν ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ, “with his holy myriads,” i. e. with myriads of his holy ones, namely, his *angels*, the hosts that are represented as accompa-

nying him. The ἐν is for σύν. Ποιεῖν κρίσιν, to exercise judgment, pass condemnation. Ἐξελέγχ. is a stronger term than ἐλέγχειν, and signifies to utterly convict, and consequently *punish*. See Schleus. Lex. Ἔργα ἀσεβείας is for ἔργα ἀσεβῆ. Τῶν σκληρῶν, "harsh things," i. e. words. Laurm. observes, that this alludes to the blasphemies mentioned supra, ver. 9 & 10. It is strange no Commentators should have compared Ps. 94, 4.

16. οὗτοί εἰσι—χάριν. Here is a resumption of what was said at ver. 12 & 13.; the οὗτοί being again used in the same sense. By the γογγυσταὶ most understand revilers and censurers of their superiors. But it seems rather to be a general term: for γογγύζω signifies to mutter, murmur, grumble, &c.; and thus γογγυστ. will denote discontented, envious, malicious persons, who, in their murmurs, spare neither man nor God.

Μεμψίμοιροι is a modification of the former; and the term is explained by Œcumen., ὁ πάντα καὶ αἰεὶ σκώπτειν ἐπιτηδεύων. Laurman thinks it equivalent to the μεμφόμενος τὸ ἀγαθὸν φιλεγκλήμων, *fault-finder*. See the spirited sketch of such persons in Theophr. Char. Eth. c. 17. It denotes, then, those who see every thing in the worst light, or (to use the words of Seneca (cited by Pric. and most other Commentators), omnia deplorantes, quibus nulla non causa in querelas placet.

By the κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι are usually supposed to be denoted those who live only for their lusts. But it may, more suitably to the preceding words, be rendered, men who care not for the opinion of others, nay, little solicitous about the favour of God, and following their own opinions only, the προπετεῖς of 2 Tim. 3, 4.

In τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα there is a Hebraism for λαλοῦσι ὑπέρογκα, scil. ῥήματα. Ὑπέρογκος signifies of exceeding bulk. So Heysch. explains it ὑπέμετρος. See the note on 2 Pet. 2, 18. I would compare Æschyl. Theb. 438. εἰς οὐρανὸν Πέμπει—κυ-

μαίνοντ' ἔπη.* “Now that there were (observes senm.) among the Jews many persons discontent with their lot, and who, hurried away by a false hope of the temporal kingdom of the Messiah, broke out into vain complaints of the injustice of God, the histories of the disturbances and seditions (which we learn from Joseph. and Sueton. were commenced by the Jews) plainly show us.”

The Apostle then adds another odious trait, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα, ὠφελείας χάριν which Rosenm. explains, “paying adulatory court to personages,” or great and influential persons. So θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον δυναστοῦ in Levit. 19, 15., and θαυμάζειν for τιμᾶν in Sir. 7, 29. In this sense, too, it often occurs in the Classical writers, especially Thucyd. But as θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον, corresponding to נִשְׂא פָנַי very often occurs in the Sept., and always in a forensic sense, synonymous with λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, or προσωποληπτεῖν, so I think with Loesner, that this is the sense here (especially as Rosenm. gives no authority for πρόσωπον, a *personage*, or dignified person;) and that this juridical term is meant to allude to the sitting in judgment, and pronouncing on men's characters, which they arrogated to themselves. The πρόσωπα may therefore (as Loesner says) denote all persons from whom they could get any thing; which is denoted by the ὠφελείας χάριν, with which I would compare Thucyd. 1, 28. φίλους ποιέσθαι οὓς οὐ βούλονται, ὠφελείας ἕνεκα. Now this ὠφελεία was, in the case of judges, some present either of money, or valuable goods; and, in the present case, much the same, or *what they could get*.

17. The Epistle concludes, as usual, with exhortation. Μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων—Χριστοῦ. The προειρημένων denotes the words which had been delivered

* One might also compare the *sesquipedalia verba* of the Poet. Bens. explains it of mystified terms and magnificent pompous phrases which had no great meaning, if any at all, but served to amuse unthinking people, and make them fancy they were let into the mysteries of the Gospel and the deep things of God.

to them by the Apostles before those false teachers crept in. This, as Rosenm. observes, may include both epistolary and viva voce instruction. See 2 Pet. 3, 2 and 3. It has been supposed that Jude was not an Apostle: but (as Laurm. observes) this passage will not prove it, any more than (as Wolf observes) Hebr. 13, 7. will prove that St. Paul was not a teacher.

18. ὅτι ἐλεγον ὑμῖν, &c. The ὅτι is rendered by Doddr. *for*; better by our Translators *how*; though that is obsolete. I would render *namely that*. The second ὅτι is suited to *citation*. The passages of the Old Testament adverted to are supposed by Knapp to be Acts 20, 29 and 30. 1 Tim. 4, 1. 2 Tim. 3, 1 seq. 4, 3. 2 Thess. 2, 3—12. 2 Pet. 3, 2 and 3. It is agreed by the best Commentators that the phrase ἐν ἐσχάτῳ is *here* not to be rigorously interpreted, but understood of future time generally. And Rosenm. observes, that the words, though predictions, were not prophecies. The Apostles *foresaw* that, after their departure, false teachers would creep in, and by attractive doctrines draw many to follow them.

By ἐμπαίικται, as at 2 Pet. 3, 3., are denoted *scoffers*, men who made a jest of serious and vital religion, and especially of the doctrines of the *advent of Christ to judgment*, and the *resurrection of the dead*. Τῶν ἀσεβειῶν (which is not found in the parallel passage of Peter) has the force of the adjective ἀσεβεῖς: and in both this passage and that I would, with Laurm., take the whole phrase as at ver. 16., and understand it of a self-willed, conceited spirit, that which follows its own fancies and whims. So that there is no occasion to adopt Bentley's conjecture ἀσελγειῶν. It was the common *interpretation*, not the common *reading*, that wanted rectifying. The epithet ἀσεβεῖς is surely applicable to such persons, since such a spirit could not but lead them to pervert the Gospel, and corrupt it by impure ad-

mixtures of their own notions: a highly presumptuous and sinful conduct.

19. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες ψυχικοὶ, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. Carpzov will have it that the hortatory part of the Epistle only commences *here*: and most Commentators regard this as a continuation of the description of the heretics, interrupted by ver. 17 and 18. But it should rather seem that the Apostle, having commenced the exhortation at ver. 17., now interprets it (hurried away by the indignation called forth by the κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορεύομενοι), and levels at them another sentence of bitter censure, exclaiming οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ, &c. “(Aye,) these are the very men who (even now) excite separations,” &c. The best Critics are agreed that ἑαυτοὺς is not genuine, but from the margin, and founded on a two-fold view of the sense; and that the term ἀποδιορίζοντες (which, however, is admitted by Schleus. to be ambiguous,) signifies those who by false doctrines (or, as Laurman explains, variety of opinions,) excited separations and schisms both of themselves and others; and (as some add) by their corrupt lives threw the society into confusion. But this is here incongruous. Tindal renders, “those are makers of sects.”

The last trait is ψυχικοὶ (εἰσι), πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. The ψυχικοὶ Laurm. well explains, homines qui, veluti animalia bruta, unicè sensuum vi et impetu feruntur, celsioris animi et rationis usu omnino destituti. See Suic. Thes. c. 1589. and the note on 1 Cor. 2, 14. Pric. and Laurman aptly compare Herm. Past. 2, 12. Hunc spiritum terrestrem habens, exaltat se, et improbus est et verbosus, et in deliciis conversatur, et in voluptatibus multis, et mercedem accipit. The πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες is explained by Rosenm., nec voluntatem, nec propositum, nec studium habent sentiendi agendique convenienter dictamini divino: destituti morali perfectione, ad quam Deus per auxilium τοῦ πνεύματος (religionis) adducit. But this I must regard as that kind of perversion which the word πνεῦ-

μα too often suffers at the hands of the *recent* foreign Divines. Krebs and J. B. Carpz. rightly explain the οἱ πνεῦμα ἔχοντες, the *unregenerate*, who only follow the impulses of nature common to brutes, who experience not in themselves, or do not yield, to the guidance of the Divine Spirit, nor have its gifts any fruit in their doctrine. See a passage of Clemen. Alex. cited by Wets. on Eph. 2, 1.

20. The Apostle now resumes his exhortations, and bids them not only beware of the artifices of the false teachers, but study to advance in religious knowledge and practice; and to ensure the success of their endeavours, he enjoins them to pray in the Holy Spirit. (Laurman.)

On the force of the metaphor in ἐποικοδομοῦντες see the note on 1 Cor. 3, 10. seq. By πίστις is here meant the *Christian religion*. And ἀγιωτάτη is a most appropriate epithet, not so much as denoting the faith *once delivered to the saints* (as Wets. and Laurman explain), as that originality in the *Holy Being*, and intended to make some men holy. So our Lord says: "Be ye holy as I am holy." Here, it may be observed, the effects of the Gospel are contrasted with those of the false teachers.

The words ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, are by some connected with the preceding; by others (and more rightly) with the following. The ἐν is for διὰ, *per. by the aid of*, under the direction of. Laurm. observes, that the best commentary on this may be derived from Rom. 8, 26. τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὼς δεῖ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις· where see the note.

21. ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε. The ἑαυτοὺς is by most Commentators rendered *yourselves*: but by others, as Ers., Pisc., Est., Bens., and Laurm., *each other*; which is more significant and agreeable to the context, ver. 20—23. And that ἑαυτοὺς often has this signification, is certain. But both may be united, thus: "Strive to preserve yourselves and each other in the love of God," or rather, "in love

to God;" for this, Bens. and Carpz. prove, is required by the context; though the term sometimes signifies the *love God bears us*.

Προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου, "expecting and trusting (thereby) to obtain mercy and acceptance with God." The εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, is exegetical of the preceding, and denotes the end to which this tends, even eternal salvation.

22, 23. To the right understanding of these verses it is necessary to attend to the sense of *ἐαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε* before laid down; and we may paraphrase thus: "(And in the exercise of this vigilant exertion to keep each in the love of God, remember that ye are not to abandon *all* those who seem to wander from the true faith, no,) *some* treat compassionately and mildly, making a distinction (between those and the desperately perverse); others (even if the danger seem great, and the chance of saving them small) yet anxiously strive to save; snatching them, as it were, out of the fire." Such, I conceive, is the true sense of these obscure verses, on which Commentators differ in opinion. And this view is supported by the authority of the best interpreters. As to the various readings, they seem to be no more than irregular methods of removing the difficulty by re-writing the passage.

Ἐλεεῖν here denotes (as often) to *treat kindly*. Διακρινόμενοι is used as a deponent for διακρίνοντες, and involves the common ellipsis μεταξὺ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων. I suspect that the Apostle did not exclude even the false teachers themselves, but intended that some exertions should be made to save even some of *them*. And as the οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε may respect the *people seduced*; so may the οὓς δὲ denote some of the *deceivers*, and to them the words ἐν φόβῳ σωθεῖτε are very suitable. Now the sense of these words is (I conceive), not "terrify with denunciations of Divine vengeance," as Grot., Pisc., Est., Bens., and almost all Commentators explain, but, "with anxiety," which implies circumspection and

exertion. So Phil. 2, 12. μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε and 1 Pet. 1, 17. ἐν φόβῳ, “cautiously and providently.” In short, it imports an anxious and diligent use of *all* the methods of reformation, not only by arguments derived from *fear*, but *love*.

Ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς is a proverbial expression, in frequent use among the Jews, and occurring also in the Classical writers; as Liban. Orat. 712 B. πολλοὺς ἴσως δυνήσεται τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξέλεσθαι.

The concluding words μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα, have much perplexed the Commentators, who, the greatest part of them, strangely wander. See Pole. The most successful have been Wolf and Bens., the former of whom thinks they contain an earnest injunction to abstain from every appearance of evil: and he compares 1 Cor 6, 20. But the words are so closely connected with the preceding that I cannot but think the meaning is: “Let, however, your endeavours to reform them be made with great caution; be careful to avoid being *yourselves* corrupted by their society, and show a hatred of whatever partakes, in the slightest degree, of vice and sin.” This, which I conceive to be the true sense, Bens. alone seems to have discerned. On the origin of the phrase μισεῖν ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα, no certainty can be attained. It was probably a proverbial one.

24, 25. Now follows the epilogus, or solemn doxology with which the Apostles usually conclude their Epistles; and this is one not inferior to any in the New Testament. The sense is too plain to require much illustration. Ἀπταιστος Valck. explains ἀπροσκοπος, qui pectus purum et firmum gestitat. I prefer ἀπτωτους. As to the reading ἀσπίλους, it is a gloss. Vorst. here recognizes an agonistical metaphor. The στήσαι is well explained, by Laurm., stare *facere*, i. e. sistere. Now στήσαι ἀμώμους answers to φυλάξαι ἀπταίστους. Κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, “in the presence of the glorious God.” Ἐν

ἀγαλλιάσει, “with exultation and holy confidence.” Compare 1 Joh. 4, 12. Μόνω σοφῶ Θεῶ. The σοφῶ is not found in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers; and it is rightly (I think) rejected by almost all Critics; not but that the epithet is very suitable, though it is not *hujus loci*. The name σωτήρ is often applied to God the Father, as the original author of our salvation. So in 1 Tim. 2, 3. and Tit. 1, 3. 3, 4. The words διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν added in some MSS., seem derived from the margin. Δόξα, scil. ἔστω, *be ascribed*. Μεγαλωσύνη, *majesty*. Κράτος, ἢ, *dominion*. There is a parallelism between δόξα καὶ μεγαλωσύνη and κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία. Compare a similar doxology in Apoc. 5, 13. Before καὶ νῦν Griesb. inserts, from a few MSS. and two Latin Fathers, πρὸ πάντος τοῦ αἰῶνος. But it is far easier to account for the insertion of such a clause in those few MSS., than for its omission in all the *rest*, all the antient versions, &c. I suspect, therefore, that it is derived from the margin, and it may be dispensed with, since νῦν will very well include *all the time up to the present instant*; whence it is sometimes used of past time. (See Steph. Thes., Viger., and Hoogev.) From the Vulgate, and the early Latin liturgies, came the doxology used in our Church, “As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end, Amen.” With this Grot. aptly compares the well known Virgilian line, *Semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt*.

FINIS, σὺν Θεῶ.








φωτισμένη - 2.

BS2341 .B657 v.8
Recensio synoptica annotationis sacrae

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00055 0162

22140C

PR

11-28-87 32180

137

MC

Group

